

THE
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A.

THIRD SERIES.

Volume II.

WITH ETCHING OF PROFESSOR GODET, BY H. MANESSE.

London:

HODDER AND STOUGHTON,

27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCLXXXV.

31
SER. 3

V. 2

1885:2

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

I.

THE BOOK OF GENESIS.

Our readers will have ere now familiarized themselves with many of the changes made in the Revised Version of the Old Testament. Some of the most striking or interesting of these were pointed out in the numerous reviews which appeared when the Revised Version was published; others will have been noticed by readers themselves. The object of this and the following papers is to explain somewhat more fully the nature and grounds of the more important alterations made by the Revisers.¹

i. 2. For "*without form, and void*" (cf. Seb. Münster² [1534]: *informis et inanis*) has been substituted the less special "*waste and void*"; the same word *תהו* is applied elsewhere to a wild and desolate expanse, *e.g.* Deut. xxxii. 10; Ps. cvii. 40.

On *moved*, the explanatory margin, *was brooding upon*,

¹ The writer of the notes on the Pentateuch and Joshua, being a member of the Old Testament Revision Company, desires it to be understood that the opinions expressed by him are simply his own, and that he in no way speaks as representing the Company. Indeed, the revision of the books in question was virtually completed before he became a member of the Company; so that in many cases he is only able to explain the grounds of a change from his general knowledge of the subject.

² Pupil of the celebrated Jewish scholar, Elias Levita, and author of a Latin translation of the Old Testament, with notes (derived largely from Jewish sources), which exercised an important influence upon the English versions of the 16th century, especially upon the "Great Bible" (1539).

should be noted. The word occurs again, Deut. xxxii. 11 ("fluttereth"). Milton paraphrases excellently :—

"Darkness profound
Covered the abyss : but on the watery calm
His brooding wings the Spirit of God outspread,
And vital virtue infused, and vital warmth
Throughout the fluid mass."—(*P.L.*, vii. 233-7).

5. *And there was evening and there was morning, one day.* Similarly *vv.* 8, 13, etc. The intention of the writer is to mark the progress of time, not to state merely (as A.V.) that the evening and the morning constituted the first day. Hence, after the work of each day, he notes the arrival of evening, and then of the morning following, the two together marking the completion of the first (second, third, etc.) day.

12. *Fruit, wherein is the seed thereof, i.e.* fruit containing the seed necessary for the propagation of the species.

21. *Sea-monsters* (cf. Job vii. 12). The term *whale* being (in modern English) too special.

30. Margin: *living soul*. The Hebrew *nephesh* is a wider term than the English "soul," denoting the sentient principle possessed by all animals generally. See Oehler, *Theol. of O. T.*, § 70. In *v.* 20 the Hebrew is literally "swarms of living souls." The Hebrew words are the same in i. 21, 24; ii. 7, 19; ix. 10, 12, 15, 16.

31. *The sixth day*. The Hebrew has here the article, with the intention, apparently, of marking the sixth day as definitely the last.

ii. 1. *And for thus*. The verse is not a summary of chap. i., but introduces the seventh day. The act of completion, marking as it does the commencement of the period of rest, is assigned by the Hebrew writer to a special day. The old correction (LXX., Sam., Pesh.), *sixth* for the first *seventh* in *v.* 2, obliterates this distinctive point of view.

4. Here begins the second account of the beginnings of man upon earth, extending to iv. 26, and evidently by a different hand from i. 1-ii. 3.

5. *And no plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field had yet sprung up.* Modern commentators are generally agreed in treating *plant* and *herb* not (as A.V.) as the objects of *made* in v. 1, but as the subjects of *was* and *had sprung up* in v. 2. The intention of the writer is to describe the condition of the earth before man was formed and placed upon it (v. 7).

14. *In front of.* From the point of view of the author, resident in Western Asia. The Tigris runs on the East, not of Assyria, but of Mesopotamia. LXX. κατέναντι, and similarly the Syriac.

iv. 1. *With the help of the Lord.* From (A.V.) is an old paraphrase (Onkelos), but no translation of the existing Hebrew text. לְעִזְרָתוֹ does not occur elsewhere in the sense of the Greek σὺν (in σὺν Θεῷ); but the similar preposition בְּ is so used in 1 Sam. xiv. 45.

7. *Coucheth* for *lieth*, bringing out the figure more distinctly. Sin is figured as a beast of prey, couching at the door, and ready to spring upon the man who allows it the opportunity.

Margins. These are the renderings adopted generally by modern commentators, the meaning being, *If thou doest well*, i.e. if thy thoughts are set on good, *will not it* (i.e. thy countenance, v. 6) *be lifted up?* (cf. Job xi. 15.) A fallen, sullen countenance, on the other hand, is an indication that evil is brooding within, which, upon the first temptation of sin, will break out in some overt act. This is expressed in the clause which follows. And (the verse continues) the desire of sin is directed towards thee; but thy duty is to cast away thy sullen looks, and overcome it.

8. *Told.* The Hebrew means regularly *said to*, not *told*, and we expect the words spoken to follow. Hence

the margin (as in Sam., LXX., Pesh., Vulg., and the two Jerusalem Targums).

23. *For wounding me, and for bruising me*, instead of, *to my wounding and to my hurt*. Lamech, in a song of triumph, celebrates the invention (v. 22) of his son. Provided with weapons of brass and iron, he has slain the man who had assailed him: if Cain was to be avenged sevenfold (v. 15), Lamech, armed as he is, may avenge himself seventy and sevenfold. The spirit of Cain appears intensified in his descendant Lamech. The margin (*will slay*) makes Lamech's words a threat only.

25. The margin, like the similar one on v. 1, is intended to explain the connexion between Eve's words and the name *Seth*. The old margins on *Cain*, "*i.e.* Gotten or Acquired," and on *Seth*, "*i.e.* Put or Appointed," are not justifiable philologically; קַיִן cannot be derived from קָנָה *to get*, and שֵׁט by analogy would mean *Appointer* rather than *Appointed*. In these and similar cases all that the text implies is an *assonance*, not an etymology. *Cain* is connected with *kanah*, not because it is derived from it, but because it resembles it in sound. The form of margin adopted here and elsewhere, while affirming nothing respecting the etymology of the proper name (which is sometimes quite uncertain), makes this connexion clear to the reader. So v. 29, Noah cannot be *derived* from *naham* to comfort, but one word resembles, and suggests, the other.

vi. 4. *The Nephilim*, mentioned again, Num. xiii. 33, among the pre-Israelitish populations of Canaan, "the Nephilim, the sons of Anak [located, v. 22, at Hebron], of the Nephilim." The derivation of the word is obscure; but from the passage in Numbers it is clear that it must have been the name of a race of giant stature. Apparently there was a popular belief that the earth was at one time peopled by a race of giants, supposed to have sprung from the union of angels with the daughters of men, the last remnants of

whom were reputed to be the ancient giant inhabitants of Hebron. See, for a fuller account of opinions respecting the Nephilim, Lenormant, *Les Origines de l'histoire d'après la Bible et les traditions des peuples Orientaux* (1880), I. chap. vii. (where, however, the etymologies suggested have only the value of conjectures).

ix. 5. The improved punctuation (agreeing with the Hebrew), has the effect of bringing out the sense more distinct.

27. *Enlarge*. The Hebrew expresses a wish or prayer, not a prediction.

x. 11. The oldest seat of civilization in the plain of the two rivers was (as the monuments also show) Babylon, not Nineveh. The R.V. represents Nimrod as founding the colony of Assyria. By this construction the required contrast is gained with v. 10, which mentions Babylon as the *beginning* of his kingdom. Assyria is called, in Micah v. 6, the "land of Nimrod."

xii. 6. *Oak* for *plain*: so xiii. 18; xviii. 1. A.V. followed Jerome and Jewish authorities; but there is no doubt that *oak*, which is already the rendering of LXX. and Syriac, is right.

9. *The South* (with the capital letter). So always in the R.V., where the word represents the Heb. *Negeb*, which is the technical geographical name for the southern tract of Judah. See Jer. xiii. 19; xvii. 26, etc. Particular parts of the Negeb were designated from the clan which inhabited them: thus we read of the "Negeb" of the Jerahmeelite, or of the Kenite (1 Sam. xxvii. 10; cf. xxx. 1, 14, 27).

xiii. 10. *Plain*, with margin: *Or, Circle*. Another technical term, applied especially to the central part of the valley through which the Jordan flows. So xix. 17. See Dean Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, Appendix, § 12.

xv. 2. Of the last words in this verse no entirely satis-

factory explanation is possible. It is true, *Dammêsek* is the Hebrew name of the city which we call Damascus; but *דמשק אליעזר* cannot be rendered (as A.V.) "Eliezer of Damascus," and even the rendering noticed on the margin of R.V. implies an inversion of the two words as well as an alteration in one (*אליעזר הרמשקי*). If the text be sound, either *Dammesek Eliezer* must be a compound proper name of very unusual type, or the words should be rendered, "Damascus of Eliezer," the meaning in this case being that Damascus, the home, or perhaps the clan, of Eliezer, would be, Abram feared, the ultimate possessor of his property. The contemptuous *this* of A.V. is quite gratuitous. *הוא* merely resumes the subject before the predicate, as ii. 14, 19; ix. 18, and often. *This* would be *זה*, as Exod. xxxii. 1. But it is not improbable that the text is corrupt. Hitzig in Germany, and (if the writer is not mistaken) Mr. Aldis Wright in this country, have conjectured independently that *הוא דמשק* is a marginal gloss upon the obscure *דמשק*, which afterwards crept into the text. For the marginal *go hence*, see Ps. xxxix. 13 [14, in Heb.].

xvi. 13. *Thou art a God that seeth*, Heb. *A God of vision*, i.e. as the sequel shows, an all-seeing God. The sense is not very different from that of the familiar *Thou God seest me*; but the latter is no translation of the Hebrew text as we have it; it would require *אל ראי* not *אל ראי*. What follows is obscure, but is generally understood to mean: Have I here also (in the desert, where I might not have expected it) looked after him that seeth me? (i.e. not seen God, when He saw her, but only when He had gone perceived that He had been with her, and then *looked after Him*). So Delitzsch (1872), Dillmann (1875, 1882), and Keil (ed. 3, 1878). But it is quite possible that there is some error in the text; *הלם*, for instance, means *hither* elsewhere, not *here*. Wellhausen's suggestion¹ is worth mentioning *הנם [אלה]*

¹ *Geschichte Israels* (1878), p. 329 (Eng. Tr. p. 326).

אֵתֵרִי רָאִי [וְאֵתֵרִי] “Have I even seen God, and am I alive after [my] seeing?” (see Jud. vi. 12; xiii. 22; Exod. xxxiii. 20). The expression *God of vision* will then signify “God who art seen,” and the name of the well will mean, *He that seeth me liveth*. In the existing text, there is nothing in Hagar’s words with which the epithet *living* in the name of the well can be connected.

xvii. 5. The meaning of the name *Abraham* is quite unknown. No root *raham* is in use in Hebrew; and nothing satisfactory is offered by any of the cognate languages. Probably all that underlies the text is the assonance of *Abraham* with *hamon*, multitude. The name *Sarai* is equally obscure.

xvii. 16. *Peoples* for *people*; here and often. A small but important change; see the Preface.

xviii. 19. *I have known him, to the end that*, etc. “Known” = noticed, entered into personal relations with, as in Amos iii. 2, referred to in the margin. An important correction. Abraham is *known* of God, in order that he may be the founder of a community perpetuating and preserving the same principles of religion owned by himself. The error in A.V. (which is patent) is remarkable; but it is as old as the LXX., and is repeated in most versions.

xxii. 14. The meaning of the proverbial phrase (cf. x. 9) here cited is uncertain; we do not possess the clue which an example of the proverb as actually used would have afforded. The R.V. gives the rendering which is on the whole best supported; the meaning being that to those who seek God in His temple, He will be present with His providence and aid. Substantially the same sense is expressed in the margin by a different construction: *He shall be seen*, or appear, viz. with His help and succour. The chief ancient versions, though pronouncing the Hebrew consonants differently, arrive also at a similar sense: LXX. ἐν τῷ ὄρει κύριος ὥφθη [rather ὁφθήσεται]; Vulg. “In

monte Dominus videbit"; Syriac, "In this mountain the Lord will see (or, provide)." There is doubtless also a play on the name *Moriah*; but the opinion which is sometimes expressed, that this word means "Shown of Jehovah," is untenable upon philological grounds (קראיה could not give rise to מוריה).

xxv. 31. *This day.* Margin: *first of all.* The original has the same force, 1 Sam. ii. 16; 1 Kings xxii. 5.

xxvii. 39. In spite of the amount of modern authority in support of the rendering *away from*, the position and connexion in which מן here stands, make it extremely questionable. At most a place in the margin is all that it deserves.

40. *Break loose.* Here, and elsewhere (Jer. ii. 31), A.V. follows the Jews in identifying יור with ירה. But the sense *roam at large* is sufficiently established from the Arabic (hence Ps. lv. 2, *to be restless*, used similarly in Arabic of a sick man's pillow: see Lane's *Arabic Lexicon*, p. 1184). The meaning is, that Edom after a time will become restless, and exert himself to gain his freedom, being in the end successful.

xxix. 32, 33, etc. The margins explain the several names as before (iv. 25), by pointing to the words which they resemble in sound.

xxx. 11. *Fortunate!* In xlix. 19 the resemblance of the name Gad to *gedud*, a troop, suggests the form of the blessing; but here the meaning is certainly *fortune*, as is already given by LXX. (ἐν τύχῃ, Vulg. *Feliciter*), and most of the other ancient versions.¹ The word here used by Leah, *gad*, is not the usual one denoting *troop* (*gedud*), whereas the meaning *fortune* is well established, both from other allusions in the O.T., and from the cognate languages, in

¹ The Syriac, *My fortune cometh*; Onkelos, *Fortune cometh*; Pseudo-Jonathan, אַתָּא מוֹלָא טוֹבָא, *the good star cometh*—following the reading given on the margin, (בָּא גַד)

which it regularly bears that sense; Gad was in fact the name of an old Phœnician and Canaanitish god, of which several proper names preserve the traces (Josh. xi. 7; xii. 7; and in Phœnician, Gad'ath, Gad-naam, etc.),¹ and which is actually named in Isa. lxxv. 11 (see R.V.).

xxxi. 19. *Teraphim*. A particular kind of image, several times mentioned (see marg.), apparently a kind of household god. Other cases will meet us in which, by the use of a general term, like *image* here, a real and sometimes important distinction has been obscured in the A.V.

21. *The River*, (with a capital). So always in R.V. where the Euphrates is meant (e.g. Ps. lxxii. 8; Isa. viii. 7, xi. 15), which was the *the* river κατ' ἑξοχὴν (elsewhere called *the great river*, chap. xv. 18, etc.), to the Hebrews.

42, 53. *The Fear*, etc. i.e. the object of Isaac's reverence; cf. Isa. viii. 13 (though the Hebrew word is different).

xxxvi. 15. The old *duke*, representing the Vulg. *dux*, which in its turn represents the LXX. ἡγεμών, has been retained, with explanatory margin, *chief*. The word (הַגִּבּוֹרִים) appears to denote properly *leader of a clan*, and was probably (cf. Exod. xv. 15) the indigenous name borne in Edom by the chiefs of the several φυλαὶ or clans.

xxxvii. 35. The margin warns the reader that the word here used in the original does not denote the material sepulchre, but is the name by which the Hebrews designated the abode of the dead—the “house of meeting for all living” (Job xxx. 23). See the Revisers' Preface.

xlix. 4. *Thou shalt not have the excellency*, viz. the excellency spoken of in v. 3.

5. *Are their swords*. The word is extremely uncertain; but the omission of the preposition *in*, in the Hebrew, is decisive against the rendering of A.V. The meaning *sword* was hinted at first by the Jews, who compared *m'khêra* fancifully with μάχαιρα, and said absurdly that

¹ See Euting, *Sechs Phœnizische Inschriften aus Idalion* (1875), p. 14.

Jacob cursed his sons in the Greek language! Nevertheless, it is probable from the context that some weapon is intended; and this sense may be obtained by deriving מְכַרְה, either from כָּרַר = כּוּר, *to dig*, or *pierce* (Gesenius, Delitzsch), or possibly from כָּרַר, *to be round* (Dillmann), as though the word denoted properly some *curved* weapon.

The margin, *compacts*, implies a different vocalization (מְכַרְוִיָּהִים), and a derivation from כָּרַר, which in Syriac means *to betroth*. The allusion will then be to the nuptial contract concluded by the sons of Jacob, on the part of their sister Dinah, with Hamor, in the execution of which Simeon and Levi assumed a prominent part (xxxiv. 25 f.). This incident is certainly alluded to in the second part of v. 6.

Houghed an ox. Such is the obvious meaning of the Hebrew, found already in LXX. (ἐνευροκόπησαν ταύρον), and alluding to the spirit of vindictive destructiveness (cf. 2 Sam. viii. 4), which, on the occasion referred to, these two sons of Jacob displayed (cf. xxxiv. 28-9). Most of the other ancient versions, however, vocalized *shur* (wall), for *shor* (ox), and עָקְרוּ (Zeph. ii. 4) for עָקְרוּ, obtaining the rendering which was adopted in the A.V.

10. The rendering of the text, which is retained from A.V., can scarcely be correct, though it is difficult to provide a satisfactory substitute. The form of the name *Shiloh* in the sense *Peaceful* or *Peace-bringer*, is not that which a derivative of the root שָׁלַח, *to be at ease*, would have; and שָׁלַח itself is not a pregnant word, like שָׁלוֹם (Zech ix. 10), but often denotes careless, worldly ease (e.g. Job xii. 6; Ezek. xvi. 49). These philological arguments against the rendering of the text are supported by the further fact, that there is no allusion to *Shiloh* as a personal name of the Messiah in any other part of the O. T.; nor is the passage so interpreted in any ancient version. *Shiloh* appears first as a name of the Messiah in a passage of the

Talmud of Babylon,¹ where the pupils of different Rabbis compliment their master by connecting his name with a title of the Messiah: thus the pupils of R. Yannai said his name was *Yinnon*, on account of Ps. lxxii. 17, where the words occur, "Let his name *be perpetuated*" (Heb. *yinnon*); those of R. Chaninah said his name was *Chaninah*, on the ground of Jer. x. 17; those of R. Shila said that his name was *Shiloh*, on the ground of the present passage. Clearly, exegesis such as this is of no value in determining the real meaning of a Hebrew phrase; and it is probable in fact that the vocalization *Shiloh* was actually meant to express the meaning *his son* (see below). It is doubtful whether the rendering *Until Shiloh come* appears at all before the sixteenth century; it has certainly only prevailed since that time, probably through the influence of Seb. Münster's version (1534), in which the clause is rendered *quousque veniat Silo* (whence it was adopted in the "Great Bible" of 1539, and subsequent English versions).

The reading of the passage found generally in the ancient versions is עַד כִּי יָבֹא שִׁלֹה—*עַד—שִׁלֹה* being a poetical equivalent of לוֹ אֲשֶׁר (see 2 Kings vi. 11; Cant. i. 7, etc.)—which may be construed: (1) *until there come that which* (or *he who*) is his; (2) *until there come he to whom* (or *he whose*) is . . ., the sentence in the latter case being without a subject, and requiring either a word such as הוּא or יְהִיָּה, referring to שִׁלֹה, or some expression denoting *dominion*. Of these, (1) is represented by the LXX. ἕως ἐὰν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ, which is a legitimate, though paraphrastic, rendering of the Hebrew, and is the first alternative reading given on the margin of R.V. (2) is represented in the variant found often in MSS. of the LXX., and in patristic citations, ἕως ἐὰν ἔλθῃ ὃ ἀπόκειται, which however is *not* a legitimate rendering of the Hebrew, as it interpolates the absent subject (*Till he come whose* [it is]), and in the rendering of On-

¹ *Sanhedrin*, 98b.

kelos, of the Targum of Jerusalem, likewise of Ephrem Syrus and of Aphraates (4th cent.), in which the word *kingdom* (*Till Messiah come, whose is* [the kingdom]) is interpolated.¹ The rendering *Till he come whose it is*, is the second alternative on the margin of R. V.—introduced, however, it may be observed, in terms simply recording the fact of its being an ancient rendering, and expressing no opinion on the question whether it is admissible as a translation of the (presumable) Hebrew עַד כִּי יָבֹא שְׁלֹה.

It has been stated that the vocalization שְׁלֹה is probably meant to express the meaning *his son*. The earliest trace of this interpretation is found in the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan, in which the clause is rendered “Till the time when the king Messiah comes, *the youngest of his* [Judah’s] *sons*,” שְׁלֹה being connected fancifully with שְׁלִיחָה in Deut. xxviii. 57 (which Onkelos renders [wrongly] by *her youngest son*). This rendering is adopted by several later Jewish authorities, as Yepheth ben Ali (10th cent.), Abulwalid (11th cent.),² David Kimchi (13th cent.), but is certainly untenable.

Antiquity, both Jewish and Christian, interpreted the passage in a Messianic sense; but this sense was not bound up with a personal name *Shiloh* (of which Christian antiquity knew, if possible, less than Jewish), but with the context of the verse, and especially with the promise of supremacy and success which it held out to Judah.

The marginal rendering, *Till he, (i.e. Judah,) come to Shiloh*, etc., was first suggested in modern times by W. G. Teller in 1766, was adopted by Herder,³ and Ewald,⁴ and has been advocated by two of the most recent commentators upon

¹ A trace of this (in the feminine וְהָיָה) perhaps appears in the Peshitto.

² Both these writing in Arabic, and perhaps influenced by the Arabic سلي (which they use in explaining it).

³ *Vom Geist der Hebr. Poesie*, ii. 6.

⁴ *Jahrbücher der Bibl. Wissenschaft*, ii. 51; *History*, ii. 283 f.

Genesis, Delitzsch (1872)¹ and Dillmann (1883). In favour of this view, Delitzsch urges the great philological difficulty alluded to above, as attaching to the popular explanation of the name "Shiloh," and observes that elsewhere in the O. T. it regularly denotes the place of that name, in the tribe of Ephraim (1 Sam. iv. 12, etc.); then, looking at the history, and supposing the fulfilment to be the settlement of the land described in Josh. xviii. 1, he points out, (1) The marks of early pre-eminence assigned to Judah, (Num. x. 14; Jud. i. 2; xx. 18; Josh. xv.); and (2) That the arrival of the Israelites at Shiloh really marked a turning-point in the history of the people—the completion of the period of wandering, the beginning of the period of rest—sufficiently important to be singled out for notice in the blessing (cf. Josh. xxi. 42; xxii. 4). The subsequent years confirmed the position which Judah thus secured; the *obedience of the peoples* was realized primarily in the victories of David (2 Sam. viii.; Ps. xviii. 43), while at the same time it would include that ideal relation of Israel to the heathen of which the prophets speak more distinctly. Thus, in its ultimate scope, the passage is still Messianic, though the thought is not attached to the word *Shiloh*.

This view, it cannot be denied, is plausible, and it is especially set forth in an attractive form by Herder. The grounds upon which the present writer² is unable to accept it, he has stated elsewhere. שֶׁבֶט, standing in ver. 10 without any qualification, appears to him to suggest a *sceptre*, not (as the view just stated requires) a *staff*, viz. of a leader or general; the promise to Judah, then, is not one of pre-eminence merely, or even of supremacy, but of *royalty*. And this interpretation seems to be confirmed by a comparison of the phrase in v. 8 *end* with chap. xxxvii. 7.

¹ Not translated. See also his *Messianic Prophecies* (T. & T. Clark), p. 33 f.

² In common with Hermann Schultz, *Alttest. Theologie* (1878), pp. 668–72; Mr. Cheyne, *Prophecies of Isaiah* (ed. 1 and 2), ii. Essay iv.; Conrad Orelli, *Old Test. Prophecy* (T. & T. Clark), *ad loc.*

Judah, however, manifestly enjoyed no royal power till long after the date of Josh. xviii. ; the passages, moreover, cited from Numbers and Joshua, attribute to Judah only dignity or priority, not *supremacy* over the other tribes. It appears to the writer, therefore, the explanation of "Shiloh" as a personal name being not less difficult upon philological grounds, than its explanation as a geographical name is upon historical grounds, that the most satisfactory rendering of the existing text¹ is that of the original LXX.: *till that which* (or *he that*) *is his shall come*. The clause may then be regarded as an indeterminate expression of the Messianic hope, which was afterwards defined more distinctly, Judah being designated as the royal tribe, and the sceptre confirmed to it *till that which is his shall come, and he have the obedience of the nations*. Whether the existing text is correct must remain undecided; but it should be remembered that in whatever way the difficult clause under discussion is interpreted, the verse as a whole is Messianic, in that it promises *an ideal future to Judah*.²

14. *Sheepfolds for two burdens*. The same word occurs with the meaning *sheepfolds*, in Jud. v. 16. Issachar, though strong, and capable of active effort, was content to recline in pastoral ease, and even to lapse into a condition of absolute servitude. The same reproach of inactivity and indolence is levelled by Deborah, in similar language, against Reuben, in Jud. v. 16.

15. *Under taskwork for unto tribute*. The word (מַס) denotes regularly not the mere payment of tribute, but

¹ The *plena scriptio* is of late introduction; many MSS. as well as all versions have שלה (not שילה).

² It stands between xxii. 17; xxvii. 29, on the one hand; and Ps. xviii. 43-4; Amos ix. 11, 12 on the other. For a fuller account of the exegesis of the passage in both ancient and modern times, the author may be permitted to refer in advance to a paper in the forthcoming number of the *Cambridge Journal of Philology*, pp. 1-28.

liability to forced labour. Cf. Jud. i. 28, 30, 33; 1 Kings v. 14; ix. 21, etc.

19. *Upon their heel.* Pursuing them in flight.

20. The reading of the margin does not substantially affect the sense, but is preferable grammatically to that underlying the text: for while merely implying a different division of two Hebrew words, it improves the construction in both verses (עָקַב: מֵאִשֶּׁר, for עָקַב: אִשֶּׁר, the ו is superfluous in v. 20—אִשֶּׁר being naturally the *nom. pendens*, as גַּר, v. 19; Deut. xxxii. 4; Ps. xi. 4; xli. 4 [Heb. 5] etc.—and desiderated in v. 19). The ancient versions have nothing corresponding to *out of*.

24. *Strong.* The word (in this form) does not occur elsewhere in Hebrew, and the precise meaning is uncertain. The rendering of the text is given by the Jews, and derives some support from Syriac.¹ That on the margin is supported by the Arabic usage, and by the use of the *Piel* conjugation in 2 Sam. vi. 16.

The last clause is very difficult and almost certainly corrupt. The text has been differently explained; it may perhaps be understood to mean *from thence*, *i.e.* from God, Joseph became a guardian and defence of his people, viz. in Egypt. But this, which is the best explanation, is strained (in particular, *stone* is never used figuratively, as *rock* is, for a *defence*), and needs more to be supplied in thought than is probable. As rendered in the margin, the third clause of the verse carries on the thought of clauses 1 and 2, pointing again, with fresh emphasis, to the source of Joseph's strength, *from thence*, *i.e.* from heaven, *from the shepherd, the stone of Israel* (titles of God; cf. xlviii. 15, and, later, Ps. lxxx. 2), *sc.* were his arms made strong. The second margin follows the vocalization of the Peshitto (מִשֶּׁם for מִשֶּׁם), cf. Ps. xx. 2. This has the advantage of relieving the verse of the awkward *from thence*, though *name* is not very appropriate

¹ If the meaning *durus, difficilis*, given by Castle, is correct.

in parallelism with *hands*. Probably the corruption in reality lies deeper, and is beyond the reach of the emendator's hand.

26. Margin : כְּרִי־עַר, *ancient mountains* (see Deut. xxxiii. 15; Hab. iii. 6), for הוֹרֵי עַר, *my progenitors* (lit. *my conceivers*), unto, the next word תִּצְוֶנָה being derived from אָוָה, and taken in its usual sense of *desire*, instead of being derived from תִּצְוֶה to mark out, circumscribe, Num. xxxiv. 7 f. (cf. for the form תִּצְוֶנָה from תִּצְוֶה), and explained as *limit, utmost bound*. This reading is represented in LXX. ὑπερίσχυσεν ὑπὲρ εὐλογίας ὁρέων μονίμων κ.τ.λ. ; and a trace of it is found, side by side with the other reading *my progenitors*, in the rendering of the fragmentary Jerusalem Targum.

l. 11. *Abel* means a grassy place, or meadow, and occurs similarly in other geographical names (e.g. Num. xxxiii. 49; Jud. vii. 22; xi. 33). It has no etymological connexion with *ebel*, mourning.

S. R. DRIVER.

THE LOST SHEEP AND LOST PIECE OF MONEY.

LUKE xv. 1-10.

THE heathen philosopher Seneca made a practice of dining with his slaves, and when challenged for an innovation so directly in the teeth of all customary proprieties and so offensive to the Roman mind, he defended himself by saying, that he dined with some because they were worthy of his esteem, and with others that they might become so. The action and its defence were alike admirable, and read a salutary lesson to the aristocrats of Rome. But it was even a greater shock to the Pharisees, and if possible even more unaccountable, that Jesus should prefer the society of notorious sinners to their own irreproachable manners

and decorous conversation. They were honestly surprised and nonplussed by His treatment of these abandoned characters. They could not understand why a teacher of holy life, instead of frowning upon the notoriously profligate, should show a preference for their society. Our Lord's explanation is ample and thorough. It was of extreme importance that His demeanour towards sinners should be made perfectly intelligible, and that its reasonableness should be put beyond a doubt. He devotes, therefore, the three Parables recorded in this chapter to this purpose.

It is perhaps worth remarking, that on one point He felt that no explanation was required. Even the Pharisees did not suspect Him of any sympathy with sin. These critics of His conduct had not failed to remark that in His presence the daring profanity and audacious license of wicked men were tamed. They could not but remark that into these doubtful companies He carried an influence that quite overmastered the habitual manners and tendencies of the degraded creatures among whom He so unostentatiously took His place. They never suspected Him of any desire to be initiated in the mysteries of crime, nor was any one blind enough to fancy He had some secret liking for the talk and experiences of the vicious. When Samuel Johnson late one night found a poor woman lying on the streets of London, exhausted with want, disease and poverty, and carried her home on his back, and nursed her with all tenderness and sought to put her in a virtuous way of living, no one misconstrued his motives. It was seen to be the Christ-like act of a simple, great, and charitable nature. But while the contemporaries of our Lord did not suppose He had any personal relish for sin, they still held it to be an unaccountable if not blameworthy feature of His conduct, that He received sinners and ate with them. For as we sometimes find ourselves laying to a man's charge that which is his chief claim to our regard, and

citing that as his weakness which in reality is his strength, so did the Pharisees and Scribes bring against our Lord as a damning accusation that very habit which is His eternal praise : " This man receiveth sinners." The most desolate and broken soul cannot desire any better account of the Saviour's work than is thus given by those who were reading off the most obvious facts of His life.

Those who so narrowly criticized our Lord's conduct might have seen its reasonableness had they been able to look at it from another point of view. With equal surprise they might have exclaimed : " Sinners receive this man and eat with Him." Among them it was a new thing that the godly should consort with sinners ; but surely it was equally novel that sinners should seek the company of One whose conversation was instinct with purity and breathed of heaven. Could the people recall many instances in which outcasts and profligates had been seen longing to talk with a man whose words were all of purity and righteousness ? These dissolute and lawless characters could themselves have explained the change. They were attracted to Jesus, because together with unmistakable sanctity, and even somehow appearing as the chief feature of His sanctity, there was an understanding of the sinner's position and a hopefulness about him which threw a hitherto unknown spell over them. Separate from sinners, as they had never before felt any one to be, He seemed to come closer to their heart by far than any other had come. He had a heart open to all their troubles. He saw them through and through, and yet showed no loathing, no scorn, no astonishment, no perplexity, no weariness. Instead of meeting them with upbraiding and showing them all they had lost, He gave them immediate entrance into His own pure, deep, efficient love, and gladdened their hearts with a sense of what they yet had in Him.

Therefore men whose seared conscience felt no other

touch, who had a ready scoff for every other form of holiness, admitted this new power and yielded to it. Old sinners broke down before Him, and with tears and simplicity as when they had sobbed out their first fault on their mother's bosom, repented of their weary life of sin. Men from whom the Roman lash could draw no word of confession; men whom society had branded as outcasts and who flung back on society a scorn as contemptuous as its own; men who had long since abandoned all belief in goodness and who delighted in showing their disbelief, were not ashamed even in the public streets, to own to Him their sin and to supplicate His mercy. Women whose vanity and light-heartedness had led them to self-loathing and despair, who forced a ghastly gaiety from hearts that lay cold and heavy as stone in their breasts, found to their astonishment that Christ did not shrink from them, but spoke to them with a tenderness and a hope which were new sounds to them. The disheartened, the polluted, the ruined, the degraded came to Him, because in Him they found an inexhaustible compassion. He did not give advice; He did not warn; He did not send them away with minute directions for godly living;—there were plenty who could do that—He *received* them, opened to them His heart, and gave them to feel through their whole being that they were loved and thought of by this highest and purest of persons.

The contrast between this new attitude of a holy person towards the sinner and that to which men had commonly been accustomed, has been finely described in the following words: "He who thought most seriously of the disease held it to be curable; while those who thought less seriously of it pronounced it incurable. Those who loved their race a little made war to the knife against its enemies and oppressors; He who loved it so much as to die for it, made overtures of peace to them. The half-just judge

punished the convicted criminal; the thoroughly just judge offered him forgiveness. Perfect justice here appears to take the very course which would be taken by injustice."

It is this then that calls for explanation. And it is explained by our Lord in three Parables, each of which illustrates the fact that a more active interest in any possession is aroused by the very circumstance that it is lost. The sheep that is lost is not on that account disregarded by the shepherd, but receives for the time greater attention than those which remain in the fold. The piece of money that has gone amissing becomes on that very account of greater immediate importance to the woman than all she has safe in her jar in the cupboard. If one of a family turns out ill, it is a small mitigation that all the rest turn out well; it is after the lost the parent's heart persistently goes. So is it with God. The very circumstance that men have strayed from Him evokes in Him a more manifest and active solicitude in their behalf. The attitude of God and of Christ towards sinners is reduced to the great principle, that anything which is lost and may be regained exercises our thought more and calls out a more solicitous regard than a thing of equal value which rests securely in our possession.

This is the principle which these Parables are intended to illustrate: that with God as with men that which is lost occupies, for the time and until restored, more of His thought and provokes clearer and larger manifestations of His love than that which has not been lost or is already restored. The figures used for the purpose of illustration must not be pushed too far. They are not so much images of our state as instances of the application of one common principle. They are instances of lost articles; that is all. It is merely accidental that there is a resemblance between the silly sheep that heedlessly nibbles the sweet grass that lies before it and so crops its way from spot to spot of

pasture till it is utterly lost, and the man who looks only to present gratification and so strays on with the same foolish thoughtlessness and unconsciousness of danger, and is only awakened to see how near akin thoughtlessness is to wickedness by finding himself involved in inextricable difficulties and threatened with danger of the most alarming kind. In like manner it may be said that we resemble lost coin that has fallen out of circulation and is lying unused and being gradually tarnished, defaced, and buried in dust; for we too have been issued with the image of our Maker upon us, but are gradually suffering it to be defaced and are dropping aside from all serviceable living. But the points of the comparison for the sake of which these illustrative instances are introduced are simply the lostness of the sheep, the money, and ourselves alike; the consequent concentration of attention on what is lost; and the joy of finding it again.

I. The first point, then, suggested by these parables is, that God suffers loss in every sinner that departs from Him. To the Pharisaic mind this was a new light on the character of God. The Pharisee himself trusted little to tenderness, much to rigid law. Naturally he thought of God as also standing upon His rights, enforcing His will by compulsion, and with equanimity punishing and driving into permanent exile those who have strayed from Him. It is a revelation to them to hear that the lostness of the sinner is God's loss; that God suffers more than the sinner in the separation. For God loves the sinner and this love is wounded, whereas the sinner has no love for God that can be wounded by separation. The silly sheep is quite satisfied with its state, while the shepherd's heart beats fast with anxiety about its possible fate. It is not the son but the mother whose hair turns grey with slow anguish as she marks the increasing frequency with which he is absent from her fireside, and how he is becoming lost to her. So

it is God who suffers and not the heartless sinner, who, without a thought of the wound he is inflicting, goes his own wretched way and courts the destruction which Christ died to save him from. All the brokenheartedness of parents who year by year watch the failure of all their efforts to lead some misguided child to well-doing; all the crushing anguish of wives who see their husbands slowly hardening in vice and sinking out of reach of their love; all the varied misery that love must endure in this sinful world, is after all but the reflection of what infinite Love suffers in sympathy with every sinner who spurns it and chooses death. Look at the sorrow of God in Christ, and say whether the loss God suffers in your separation from Him be true or feigned.

This was what the Pharisees had wholly left out of account, that God loves men and mourns over every ill that befalls them. And this is what we find it so hard to believe. It is only very slowly we come to believe even in human love. With difficulty we believe that there are persons to whom it would give real pleasure to make a sacrifice for us. How impossible is it for a child to understand the love his parent has for him. How few of us conceived anything of the tenderness and intensity and persistence and self-sacrifice of parental love, till we ourselves grew up and had it interpreted to us by our own feelings. In some of us, grief for lost friends or parents has been embittered by the thought of what we might and would have done for them, had we only sooner learned what we have since discovered of their love for us. Are none of us preparing for ourselves a similar remorse by our neglect of that Love which is the true spring of all other affection, and itself greater than all?

These Parables thus bring us face to face with the most significant and fertile of all realities, God's love for us. This love encompasses you whether you will or no. Love

never asks leave ; it cannot ; it enters like sunshine, and often where it seems much out of place. You may destroy all love to God in your own soul, but you cannot destroy His love for you. It persists, because it is love. It waits patiently for requital ; it humbles itself to be often slighted, often misconstrued, often refused. Can it be true that God loves you ; that you yourself are connected by this most fruitful of ties to the eternal God ? Surely there is no question that may more worthily engage the attention ? It will not do for a man to persuade himself he is honourable and rightminded, if he is making no account of this expenditure of love upon him. This is no question of casuistry that plain men need not trouble their heads about. It is no question of doctrine which a man may believe or disbelieve and still remain sound at heart. It is a question regarding our conduct towards a Person, a question that touches what lies deepest in our life and character.

II. Secondly, these Parables suggest that the very fact of our being lost excites action of a specially tender kind toward us. God does not console Himself for our loss by the fellowship of those who have constantly loved Him. He does not call new creatures into being and so fill up the blank we have made by straying from Him. He is not a Sovereign who has no personal knowledge of His subjects, nor an employer of labour who can always get a fresh hand to fill an emptied post : He is rather a shepherd who knows His sheep one by one, a Father who loves His children individually. He would rather restore the most abandoned sinner than blot him from his place to substitute an archangel. Love is personal and settles upon individuals. It is not all the same to God if some other person is saved while you are not.

“Thou art as much His care as if beside
Nor man nor angel lived in heaven or earth.”

When men sin, therefore, and fall into difficulties, God

cannot remain indifferent or quiescent. Interference of a direct and special kind becomes necessary. The normal relations being disturbed, and man becoming helpless by the disturbance, it falls to God to restore matters. A new set of ideas and dealings are brought into play. So long as things go smoothly and men by nature love God and seek to do His will, there is no anxiety, no meeting of emergencies by unexpected effort, hidden resources, costly sacrifice. But when sin brings into view all that is tragic, and when utter destruction seems to be man's appointed destiny, there is called into exercise the deepest tenderness, the utmost power of the Divine nature. Here where the profoundest feeling of God is concerned, where His connexion with His own children is threatened, Divinity is stirred to its utmost.

This appears, among other things, in the spontaneity and persistence of the search God institutes for the lost. The shepherd who misses one of his flock does not sit down by the ninety and nine in the pasture, but straightway goes in search of the lost. He does not expect that it will seek him; he goes after it. He does not expect to meet it coming home to him, so that if he had only waited and left it to itself, it would have found its own way back. On the contrary, he knows the recovery of the sheep depends wholly on himself and he prepares himself for trouble, provocation, risk. On him must fall the burden of finding it, of devising means of rescue and of bringing it back to the fold. Yet men sometimes seem to suppose that God is not alive to their dangers, but needs to be aroused to take a livelier interest in their condition and to help them in their strivings against evil. He is thought of as sitting coldly watching our passionate and almost despairing struggles to break away from evil and make our way back to a pure and helpful life; as if He were saying, I will let this sinner learn what it is to have strayed from Me. But

it is not so : God is as truly beforehand with the sinner as the shepherd with the sheep. The initiative is God's ; and all that you desire or do in the way of return to righteousness is prompted by Him. He has already sufficiently shown that He is alive to the emergency and that no trouble is too great, no sacrifice too great, while there is a possibility of saving the human soul.

God's search is also persistent. The woman of the Parable sweeps out every dusty corner ; she shakes out every article of clothing ; she lifts boxes that have not been lifted for years ; she carefully searches drawers where she knows the coin cannot be ; she reads the face of every one who has come near her house for a month ; she exhausts every possibility of finding her piece of money. Possibly she required it to make up a sum for a purchase. Certainly God needs us for some end He has in view. This is not our whole history, that with immense outlay of Divine resources we are restored to permanent rectitude. There must be much beyond, and for this God prepares us now. The experiences of earth, however exalted, do not exhaust the eventfulness of our eternal life. Therefore God seeks us with earnestness as if we were necessary not only to His love but to His purposes. He makes diligent search. He leaves no stone unturned. With active, intelligent, unwearied search, He strives to win the sinner to purity and love. Christ astonished men on earth by the company into which He found His way, and by the affection with which He spoke to low and worthless people ; and so does He still by means less observable, but equally efficient, seek to win men to the recognition of His love and of all the good He makes possible. The shepherd sought "until he found" his sheep ; the woman swept diligently "until she found" her coin. But while God's search is infinitely more persistent, it may be baffled by the cold indifference, the resolute badness of the sinner.

III. The third point illustrated by these Parables is the exceeding joy consequent on the restoration of the sinner. "Joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth more than over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance." The joy is greater, because the effort to bring it about has been greater, and because for a time the result has been in suspense, so that when the end is attained there is a sense of clear gain. The joy of success is proportioned to the difficulty, the doubtfulness of attaining it. All the hazards and sacrifices of the search are repaid by the recovery of the lost. The value of the unfallen soul may intrinsically be greater than the value of the redeemed; but the joy is proportioned not to the value of the article, but to the amount of anxiety that has been spent upon it. So that Christ virtually says to the Pharisees: "You murmur at Me; but if you were in sympathy with heaven you would rejoice with Me. You need no repentance,—at least you think so; and for this very reason I seek to attract those who do. Their state is admittedly precarious, and to win them will be clear gain to the kingdom of heaven. The finding is an intenser joy than the keeping safe, because the loss has been actually felt and is now relieved, the pang of separation has been actually endured and is now swallowed up in the joy of restoration."

To the sinner then, these Parables say, It is your unspeakably happy privilege to give God joy. There is no joy comparable to the joy of successful love; of love, that is to say, not only recognised and returned, but which succeeds in making the object of it as happy as it desires, and does so after many repulses and misunderstandings and hazards. This is God's greatest joy. When God succeeds in securing the happiness, the inward purity and rectitude, and therefore the happiness, of any one who has been estranged from Him, there is joy in heaven. What can more worthily give joy to intelligent beings than the in-

crease of goodness? God's joy is the unspeakable joy of the parent who for many years has been anxiously watching his son's growth, his leanings, his temptations, his resolutions, his declensions, his alienations of spirit, and at length sees proof that the lad is wholly sound at heart, that he has chosen the better part and thrown off all vice that clung to him, that he is bent now upon a pure and honourable life, and with his own soul hates the thought of evil, that he has finally abjured the allurements that tempted and bound him formerly, and has in himself that deep principle and those wise and generous dispositions which will guide him in all circumstances and in all companies. This joy you have it in your power to give to God. There is a joy which no one but yourself can excite in God, a joy over your repentance, over your return to good; a joy therefore which none but yourself has the humble glory of stirring in the mind of God.

In this joy the angels are represented as sharing. Their experience of the blessedness of life with God gives them sympathy with all who enter that life. They know the happiness that lies before every one who yields himself to God's purpose and to God's love, and therefore they rejoice. And if it be true that the conversion of one soul be so reasonable a ground of joy to those who are merely spectators, what unspeakable gladness ought it to bring to those who themselves experience it. Have you ever had such happiness that you would deem it reasonable that all Heaven should rejoice with you in it? Yet there is such happiness open to you. Uninteresting, solitary, monotonous and unobserved as your life may seem, it is, if there be truth in these words of the Lord, an object of intensest interest to God and angels. With all its evils, its fears, its misery, it may be lifted to so true a harmony with the ever-living God that those pure and discerning spirits who see it, cannot forbear rejoicing over it with well-grounded satisfaction.

If God with all heaven is thus in sympathy with us, defeated in our defeat, triumphing in our victory; if the cause of love and moral order is one throughout the universe, we have every encouragement to play our part well. It is no short and easy passage of arms we are called to; we are wearied and often overcome by the constant accompaniment of sin, weakness and folly in all we do; but in all this evil and conflict there is material for victory and joy. Are you weighted by nature with a poor craven spirit, a vain selfish heart, sordid or gross passions, a feeble inconstant will, a nature that often causes shame? Humbly recognise all this as what you are actually called to master; do not waste your energies envying those who have a better nature and an easier task, but face the conflict that actually awaits you and carry into it the assurance that every stroke for the right and every defeat of evil you accomplish has an echo of the truest kind in heaven. Remember the greater joy God has in the painful, difficult, penitential return of a lost soul than in the easy righteousness of the naturally pure.

MARCUS DODS.

DEAN CHURCH.

THERE is a mountain which divides the Austrian and the Bavarian Tyrol, the top of which is a narrow, level, undulating ridge about the width of a London pathway, and as easy walking, where you may go on and on for miles. Right and left the ground falls away sharply enough to leave the view clear, and is not steep enough to trouble the nerves. Each side the prospect stretches far. On one side lawns and woods and lakes lead the eye to purple glimpses of the wide horizon of the great plain that is so

poetical at a distance; on the other there are peaks and snowfields and glaciers. One side of the way is often in cloud, and the other in sunshine, and perhaps there are clouds in the valley close below, and gleams of sunlight on the distant heights. Those who know that strange and pleasant mountain path will be reminded of it again and again in reading the works of the present Dean of St. Paul's. There is the same sense of moving easily at a level which it is generally hard to reach and to maintain. There is the same sense of treading safely between unmeasured depths, of looking out from the dividing line into regions of unexplored space. It is not easy to survey the questions of the day clearly or calmly while one is on a level with them or, it may be, below them, while the dust of the battle beats in our faces or the roar of the combat is heard overhead. The conflict between the Church and the world takes many forms. Civil and ecclesiastical law come into collision in civil courts; scientific discoveries, and still more scientific tendencies, come into collision with dogmas and traditions,—which may or may not be as sacred and unalterable as dogmas. Civilization and religion develop upon different lines, and to keep up with the development of either is enough and more than enough to tax the measure of the strength of one generation. It is easy to heat and confuse ourselves over such issues, especially easy for non-combatants, who go down in the pride and naughtiness of their hearts to see the battle. It is easy, too, to keep ourselves at peace by cultivating a lazy belief, which grows apace like an ill weed, that nothing which is disputed or disputable matters; and not very difficult, if so much concession makes some residue of conscience troublesome, to verify the importance of what will hardly be disputed in our time, and persuade ourselves we value it as it deserves by all means, even by acting upon it.

In a sense, it may be said that these questions are Dean

Church's speciality. Whenever they are solved—in the measure, in which Clement, Augustin, Aquinas solved them, each for his own age and for a long posterity now gone by—some of the praise of the solution will be due to him, on the principle *Prudens interrogatio dimidium scientiæ*. He will never allow us to heat or confuse ourselves; he will never allow us to be indifferent. He is as sobering as Bishop Butler, and he is not so depressing or perplexing. Bishop Butler leaves us under the impression that there is no more thinking to be done; that we have only to accept a digest of scriptural teaching as probably true, and act upon it as a matter both of prudence and conscience. Dean Church never loses hold upon the great sayings, "Seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you." If he does not teach us what to think, if he has been hindered by health or other occupations from thinking out the questions which have come before him, he has set an example, which will be followed in time, of the way in which it is well to think of delicate and difficult matters.

To take the smallest question first. Dean Church was always on the side of ecclesiastical liberty. In his early articles on St. Anselm, he went so far as to idealise the dispute about investiture. He assumed that a saint must have been interested in a cause in which he was content to suffer. Later he came to see that St. Anselm only obeyed orders. He had heard a pope at the head of a general council pronounce Anathema on those who thenceforward accepted lay investiture; that was his answer when Henry invited him to work with him as Lanfranc had worked with his father; that was his answer when St. Ivo of Chartres, himself a learned canonist, argued that the point was not worth a schism or even a persecution; this made him as rigid as he had been flexible and indulgent in the training of his monks, as he had been large-hearted in the question of Henry's marriage. He suggested no

compromise, though when a compromise was arranged over his head he was perfectly willing to accept it. He showed no exultation in the victory, which Dean Church still assures us he had gained. On the question of appeals, the later monograph decides against Anselm; not on the ground that no English Archbishop—with the doubtful exception of St. Wilfrid—who has gone over sea for help has ever found any, but on the ground that the cause of national independence was the right cause, even when asserted by a brutal king and barons. At most it might be maintained that the cause of Anselm against Rufus, like the cause Pius VII. against Napoleon, was the cause of law against arbitrary will. It is characteristic that the question whether Anselm was as unequal to his position as he had thought himself, is never raised by an author always loth to sit in judgment. One thinks a stronger man might have held his own after such a moral victory as Anselm had gained at the head of the barons over Rufus and his servile bishops.

But long before these reserves were formulated, when everybody was scared with the first of the famous Privy Council judgments, Mr. Church, as he was then, stated the case for state interference with a force and breadth that Stanley could not have surpassed. He proved that Henry and Elizabeth and the Privy Council had done nothing but what Theodosius and Justinian and Charlemagne and other emperors had done without a word of protest; and yet he was as strongly in favour of abolishing the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of temporal courts as anybody. Only he would not heighten or encumber his case with a theory that the jurisdiction was an usurpation or a sacrilege not to be tolerated without apostasy. Indeed, when the nation was unanimous, when the state was Christian, it might not be without advantages; only when the nation was divided, when the state was secularized, it became a grievance, to be

got rid of like other grievances, by constitutional agitation. And the agitation was to be temperate. It was well always to remember that the Church of England, the clergy as an estate of the realm, had been less oppressed, less humiliated, less plundered than in any other part of Christendom (how far is this true of the states of the house of Hapsburg?); that Christianity was still part and parcel of the common law to a much greater extent than elsewhere. One does not know which is most remarkable: to admit so much just after the Gorham case, when the article was written, or to maintain so much after the Ridsdale case, when it was republished. Happily, litigation is not life, and it is in regulating the temper in daily life that Dean Church excels. What can be subtler than the warning to the clergy not to be led away by feminine influence, reinforced by the example of Port Royal, which proves so conclusively that mere discretion, mere austerity, are not safeguards? And few things are more impressive than the warning against the temper of those who think they do well to be angry. The warning is more impressive because it is so sympathetic; the apparent justification for the temper is put so strongly, the sense of almost prophetic insight which goes with it is recognised so frankly, that we seem to be reading an analysis of a temptation overcome in secret. Is it thankless to add that the analysis hardly gains by the illustrations? Did Lacordaire really effect so much more for the French Church than Lamennais or than Veuillot? For some twenty years he half persuaded a section of the educated public to hope that the Church was going to be what it never has been or can be. This made a great many believers happy for the time, and even disposed unbelievers to hope that whenever the Church was like that they too might be converted. Lamennais and Veuillot taught the faithful to know their strength, to choose their ground and close their ranks, and fall fighting if they fell.

Again, the late Mr. Sibthorp was very heavenly minded, and consequently very amiable; he was also very undecided. Mr. Allies' very candid autobiography shows that his temper was difficult, but he knew his mind. What does the contrast teach? That it is worth while to drill oneself into gentleness at the risk of indecision? Perhaps it is natural to one exquisite character (one may venture to speak of it after the late Rector of Lincoln's posthumous testimony to his living friend) to think that another must be attractive to all.

And our author seems to hold that, after all, the power of the clergy for good does not depend so much upon their knowing their own minds as upon their knowing their own hearts. If theology for him is still the queen of sciences she is almost a constitutional queen, and therefore the more inviolable.

In the very remarkable sermon on the twofold debt of the clergy—to the wise and to the unwise—we find an admission which would have been paralyzing to many. "We cannot stop this great movement of men's minds; we ought not to wish to stop it if we could, for we should certainly not know how, and should only do harm. Directly I suppose we cannot do much to control. It will take its course." Are not the clergy bankrupt, and therefore out of debt? No. "We owe the debt of keeping from ignorant and indiscriminate hostility, of not assuming to ourselves and to our own persons with empty and boastful impertinence the supremacy and sacredness of our cause, of keeping clear of that dreadful self-complacency which so often goes with imperfect religion. We owe the debt of not raising false issues, of not meddling with what we may know we do not understand, of not darkening counsel on matters on which truth is hard very often to reach at best, with a multitude of ill-considered words." And again, "Let us not get into the way of frightening one another and

exaggerating what may be or may seem unsatisfactory and dark. I know there is enough to make the stanchest and wisest minds feel sometimes anxious." So in a sermon on Responsibility, we read of "future possibilities impending over our children which one does not like to think of." And yet these are not the only difficulties. "We often associate self-wisdom, self-conceit, self-will with activity of mind and love of knowledge: we shall see that they dwell in equal measure with entire incapacity to know, and that to be ignorant is not to be teachable." Are the teachers and guardians of truth to be trusted? We are told, there is no more pathetic sight than to see a gifted mind "pressing, honestly pressing, on others the lesson which it will not learn; profitable to the general order of the world, and mischievous and even fatal to itself." Is tradition a safeguard? No. "We must not fear to confess our ignorance, though it may be said to be retreating from positions which great men, great teachers, great schools of theology, have agreed to maintain at very different times and with opposite tendencies."

The real safeguard is sobriety and elevation of character. One of the first observations which the author presses upon the perplexed is that it is a mistake to be in a hurry; time is such a large element in all growth, and if we could believe, opinions to be worth anything must be allowed time to grow. Arguments ought to be looked at all round, in all lights. The weight of an argument may be very different before and after foreign travel, with its enlargement and its dissipation. So, too, if it is easy to be too ready to crush an antagonist with "statements of effects and tendencies," and to deal recklessly in "rash contrasts, rash disparagements," there is encouragement in the rule to "suspect whatever has the mark of insolence, wherever you see it, as much as if it had the mark of untruth or of impurity." There will be very little need to surrender anything at the

call of criticism if we wait to be challenged by critics in whom we can recognise all the marks of the wisdom which cometh from above.

And one is led to another question: Are apologetics the real safeguard of fundamental truth? Are not foundations perhaps safest when they are out of sight, when the building that rests on them is inhabited and adorned? It certainly seems to be Dean Church's habit to assume orthodoxy rather than to state it, to illustrate it rather than to defend it. The question with him is not what is true, but truth, the highest truth, being what it is, how ought it to regulate our character and temper, in action and in speculation, in feeling and in conduct. Perhaps, too, there may be another reason for dealing less in pure than in applied theology. Long as Christianity has been accepted, it has been so little practised that many disputations are still doubtful, and many are weak in the faith. Was this the reason—there must surely have been a reason—for a remarkable omission in the volume on St. Anselm? There is a description of most of his treatises, a sufficient and sympathetic explanation of his fundamental position—faith seeking understanding—there is a clear description of the way in which he came to his famous demonstration—so admired and so ineffectual—of the Being of a God, which can hardly be said to have influenced thought at all, at the time or since. The theory of Satisfaction, to which St. Anselm was led in his efforts to explain the Incarnation, has reigned in all orthodox schools from the days of St. Thomas Aquinas hitherto; but we learn nothing about it one way or other from Dean Church. Perhaps he is of the mind of the writer of a very remarkable review in the *Guardian*, on one of the late Dr. Bushnell's statements of *his* theory of the Atonement—that the Atonement is a mystery—of which one thinker may hope at most to apprehend one aspect, while such a grasp of the doctrine as a whole as may be

possible to theology upon earth must be the work of many ages and of many minds.

A theologian who makes reserves is generally rather unsettled himself; he is apt to be very unsettling to others. But this does not hold of Dean Church or of his predecessor Dean Milman. Unlike in much else, they are alike in their attention to the severer facts of life and the lessons they drew from them. Both think that Christianity will last as long as sorrow and sin; it may be said of both, especially of Dean Church, that they distil a tonic from the bitter herbs which were Pascal's daily meat. Dean Church is eloquent upon what Pascal could never discover, the simple pleasure and the delight in work which have been granted to many, great and small; but he appeals with confidence to "the contingencies too terrible to speak of, the dread certainties which nothing can avert." He quotes as if it were an oracle, the famous saying, "The last act is always tragedy." Perhaps it is as a rule; we cannot all expect to find the promise of Eliphaz the Temanite true, "to come to the grave in full age as a shock of corn cometh in in his season." The son of Sirach did not count upon it; yet he saw nothing tragical in the common lot, whether we have lived ten, or a hundred or a thousand years, so he asks, "Why art thou against the pleasure of the Most High?" One would not set the son of Sirach up to rebuke the passionate cry against death that meets us on the lips of righteous Hezekiah, and of so many psalmists, who all lived before His coming Who, tasting death for every man, purchased for all the right to look upon death simply "as the last in the round of nature's tasks." On such a subject the authority of Coleridge is as high as Pascal's, and Coleridge, who did not make light of judgment, has left it on record that he did not fear death. True, none who contemplate death at a distance with equanimity can be sure that they will die easily or meekly when their time comes; yet this does not prove that such peace

is false while it lasts. Children are often fractious as bed-time draws near, troublesome to themselves and to others—shrinking from the change they need—in some difficult or ill-managed nurseries the trouble comes round night after night, but even there it does not overshadow the day; children learn and play without a thought of the bad half hour which in the worst nurseries does not always come. Is it really wise to make a bulwark of faith out of the fear of age? a bulwark sure to fall if ever hygiene improves so far that most men live out their time, and fall asleep at last full of days. Perhaps this is imputing too much. Hygiene is not perfect yet; till it is the possibilities and probabilities which haunted Pascal are certainly enough to make reasonable people serious, and if the faith is rejected in our time it will be rejected without consideration—in other words by those who are not serious or reasonable; for if the majority were serious and reasonable, the currents of thought which carry men of science, now and again, away from traditional Christianity, would at worst be dangerous to a minority of students; as it is, they carry away those who dabble in them.

And seriousness and spirituality, if they could only be had, would be a protection not only against the frivolity which is in haste to apostatise, but against the curiosity which is in haste to dogmatise, the cruel cowardice that finds it a relief to be sure of its fears; which will press such questions as, the number of the elect, which the Lord did not answer, though, as Dean Church observes, any other teacher would certainly have been made to answer if he knew—and it is more reasonable to ask, “Can we really know?” than “on hints and notices which we cannot fully understand, to undertake to complete that which He left unfinished.” The preacher is impartial in his reticence, he refuses to minimise as he shrinks from expanding and systematising: it is noteworthy that so clear and keen a thinker should

refuse to discuss one of the burning questions of the day, and shut us up to ignorance and trust in the justice and mercy of God.

Another burning question is inspiration—the relation between what Christianity has done for the world and what the world has somehow done for itself. Here our author has something more positive to say. The comparison of the Gifts of Civilization, to the Gifts of the Spirit which edified or did not edify the Church of Corinth, is as luminous in its way as Chamfort's title page, which contained all the substance of Sieyes' epoch-making pamphlet on the *Tiers Etat*. For those who have not forgotten what it was to believe, it is obvious that the gifts of science, like the gifts of tongue and of prophecy, have to be subordinated to faith, hope and charity. The suggestion is interpreted by the two lectures on Civilization before and after Christianity, and by the tantalising lectures on the Effects of Christianity on the Greek and Latin and Teutonic races. There is no doubt, of course, that the civilization which grew up in the Name which is above every name, is higher than the civilization which sprang up in the name of Apollo, and flourished and abounded and ran to seed in the name of Juppiter Optimus Maximus. It has been fuller, richer, it has reached farther, it has lasted longer, and it is by no means certain that we are come to the gleaning of the grapes even yet. If we could follow this out in detail, considering one by one each of the races which have gone to make up Christendom, and ascertaining what each has gained, the inquiry would be interesting, and the results convincing. It is a plausible view that Christianity has redeemed the Teutonic race from what the Latin races call brutality, for they are apostatising from it in such numbers that we can argue with some confidence that the brutality into which they relapse is hereditary.

But in the present state of historical science one can-

not be sure that Christianity cured the Greeks of levity and sensuality. Was not Plutarch as staid and stedfast and respectable as any Phanariot? Was there any perceptible difference between the Græculus esuriens of the days of Juvenal, and the *Grec* of Paris, or the Riviera? or again, between Greek fishermen in the days of Lucian, and now? Was not the same hard, simple, innocent life led under the shadow of the same fancies and the same fears? Again, while we keep to the East, what reason have we to say that Christianity is for sincere believers a far more spiritual and inward thing than Islam? Could one say that the difference existed in the West even in the days of Joinville—one can judge by his book of the character of his piety—in what is it unlike the piety of a good Mussulman, except in that it was more happily directed? So, too, it would be interesting to know that Christianity endowed the Latin race with the spirit of tenderness, but what is the extent of the Latin race? Does it include Francis of Assisi—his family name was Bernardone, which points to German descent. Can it include St. Augustine—surely, in spite of an excellent Latin education, he belonged to the Punic race—itself a mixed one.

Perhaps it is hardly worth while to argue such points; it would be better, if one could, to keep to the method of the review of *Ecce Homo*, and Dr. Newman's *Apologia pro Vita*, which appeared in the *Guardian*, where the reviewer, instead of wrangling with his author, draws out from him what it is well to press. In a book like *Ecce Homo*, which, magnificent as it is, bristles with questionable points, it was really a triumph to keep from discussion without sinking into a *précis*; giving the full force of the book, and turning it in the direction which the critic thinks desirable. It was easier, in reviewing the *Apologia*, to show how much in Dr. Newman belonged to those whom he had left, but this too is done as few could do it. Perhaps the masterpiece

of this method is the famous essay on Dante—on which there is little to say, because it is so perfect. A classical introduction to a classic. No doubt Zoilus was the father of all critics who criticise for the sake of criticising, as Dr. Church says in his book on Spenser, "There is no great work of art, not excepting the Iliad or the Parthenon, which is not open, especially in point of ornament, to the scoff of the scoffer, or to the injustice of those who do not mind being unjust." If the Faery Queene is more open than the Iliad or the Parthenon, we need not ask, how much? It is more instructive to compare Spenser with Pindar (one is a survival of the age of chivalry, one a survival of the heroic age), and to observe that of Spenser's two great interests, love and manliness, "we still think with Spenser about manliness, we have ceased to think with him about love;" shall we cease to think with him about manliness, too, when we cease to conquer or to colonise? Side by side we have a recognition and an explanation of the vein of coarseness there is in Spenser, and an emphatic rebuke for the flattery of Queen Elizabeth, which in its whole range and extent was certainly unique in history.

If one wishes to see how severe Dr. Church can be, one must turn to the essay on Montaigne, who "keeps religion at arm's length as long as it is safe to do so;" who "felt the attractions of truth, but none of its obligations." And the critic feels the charm of Montaigne; he does not seem to feel the repulsion towards him which he feels towards De Maistre and the Puritans. No doubt De Maistre was often tempted into the falsehood of extremes; he was a self-educated man, which is the same as saying that he was not an accurate scholar; he was too ready to ride a theory hard over a country he did not know; he was the first modern writer to discern the immense services the Papacy had rendered to Christendom on the break up of the Roman Empire, and it seems likely that he made the same mistake

as Rienzi, and took memories for hopes. But after all, he was transparently honest, anxious to look facts in the face, to know and own the worst, and make others own and know it too. He was not responsible for the insincere optimism of his French disciples, who undertake not only to refute the Provincial Letters, but to prove that Leo X. was an exemplary Pope because he observed chastity and read his breviary.

As to the Puritans, we must measure Dr. Church's distaste for them by his admiration for Hooker and Andrewes. He contrasts Andrewes' rich patristic illustrations of pure theology, and the mystery of the Incarnation, with the anxious, scrupulous Puritan scholasticism, that turned exclusively on soteriology; he contrasts his high and liberal devotion—while reminding us that devotion has been yet keener and soared yet higher—with all the jealousy of self and others which seems to lose sight of the salvation of the world. One wishes that he had been led to deal with Puritanism more largely. It would be interesting to know his mind on the subject of Puritan discipline—the discipline of Geneva, of Scotland, and of New England. It is incomparably the heaviest yoke the human spirit has ever worn—the Inquisition let the herd go free. Wherever it has had its perfect work, it has brought about the euthanasia of Puritan theology, which built upon the remorse of the undisciplined conscience—in Unitarianism, which the founder of Puritan theology fondly hoped would perish with Servetus. On the other hand, no community, no class even, has worn that yoke without profit; it might even be asked whether any community which has not worn it has been unmistakably the better for what is called the Reformation, or can ever be fit for Parliamentary government? It is easy to say too much about the unloveliness of Puritan asceticism; after all, the romance and glamour of mediæval asceticism was mostly glamour and romance. Clairvaux, when St. Bernard

was there, was uglier then Littlemore. Still, when all is said, it does seem that the Puritans failed beyond most ascetics to observe the great precept, "to anoint the head and wash the face." They were of a sad countenance. The world had some excuse for taking them for hypocrites.

They too were of those who think they can do well to be angry. They took heavily the contrast which most Christians take so lightly, the contrast between Christ's words and Christian society, a contrast to which Dr. Church has devoted one of his most luminous sermons, which leaves us after all perplexed. We come nearer to a solution—almost as near as it seems possible to come—in a passage like this, in a sermon on Christ's Example: "These higher ends of life may be the object of deep and fervent effort, where the eye of a looker-on rests upon what seems too busy to be exalted—to be the scene of the greatest of earthly endeavours in the discipline of the soul. Surely it may be there, where to the outward eye nothing is the token of its presence—may be there, with its bitter surrender of illusions, its keen self-control, its brave and deliberate welcomings of pain masked behind the turmoil of public life or the busy silence of study—it may be there, stern and high in its scheme of life, stern in its view of the world, stern in its judgment of self, stern in its severity to sin, yet nothing appear without but the performance of the common round of duty, nothing be shown but the playfulness which seems to sport with life.

*"Se sub serenis vultibus,
Austera virtus occultit.
Timens videri ne suum
Dum prodit amittat decus."*

This is hardly doctrine for all; it is not for all to follow, still less for all to utter. In one sense it is true, as he

tells us, there is only one standard for Christians, the standard of heroism, but it is reflected on very different levels. After all, it is impossible for the Church and civilization to live at peace if we will not recognise that there are counsels as well as precepts. The saints do more than is required of all; even they hardly do all that is required of them. No one could suspect the magnificent sermon on the Servants of God (which was preached before the University of Oxford on the death of Dr. Pusey), with being tainted with the clumsy mediæval theory of works of supererogation, but it expresses all the schoolmen meant. "Certainly in the New Testament, over and above the ordinary and true Christian life, the life of those who invariably use this world without abusing it, and live soberly, righteously and godly in it,—who in honest duty and self-discipline, and self-denial willingly accept their Master's yoke, and whatever comes on them of His cross, there is exhibited a pattern of life, and type of character in which the common interests and objects which attract and occupy us are not only subordinated, but given up and put aside for a greater and more exacting service. . . . Have we learned that it is a fiction permitted only in simple times, to imagine a man really living his daily life as the servant of an unseen Master; living only to please if it may be, and to do the work of the unseen Power, who brought him into existence, and whom he believes to be his Preserver and Redeemer and Saviour, who loves him better than he can ever know or realize here, for whom he can never do service enough, and for whom he is willing to give up that men most care for, to endure trouble, and hardship, so that in his inner and secret experience, the life of joy and hope and trust and liberty of the heart, which is impressed in all its shades and contrasts in the book of Psalms." Of that book Dr. Church has said elsewhere, "to pass to them from many a famous book of modern speculation is like passing into the

presence of the mountains and the waters, and the midnight stars from the brilliant talk of London drawing-rooms."

G. A. SIMCOX.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

VII.

THE ULTIMATE PURPOSE OF RECONCILIATION AND ITS HUMAN CONDITIONS.

"To present you holy and without blemish and unproveable before Him: if so be that ye continue in the faith, grounded and stedfast, and not moved away from the hope of the gospel which ye heard, which was preached in all creation under heaven; whereof I Paul was made a minister."—COL. i. 22, 23 (Rev. Ver.).

THE Apostle has been sketching in magnificent outline a vast system, which we may almost call the scheme of the universe. He has set forth Christ as its Lord and centre, through whom all things at first came into being, and still continue to be. In parallel manner he has presented Christ as Lord and Centre of the Church, its lifegiving Head. And finally he has set forth Christ as the Reconciler of all discords in heaven and earth, and especially of that which parts sinful men from God.

And now he shows us here, in the first words of our text, the purpose of this whole manifestation of God in Christ to be the presenting of men perfect in purity before the perfect judgment of God. He then appends the condition on which the accomplishment of this ultimate purpose in each man depends—namely, the man's continuance in the faith and hope of the Gospel. That leads him to gather up, in a series of clauses characterizing the Gospel, certain aspects of it which constitute subordinate motives and encouragements to such stedfastness. That is, I think, the outline

connection of the words before us, which at first sight seem somewhat tangled and difficult to unravel.

I. We have then, first, to consider the ultimate purpose of God in the work of Christ.

"To present you holy and without blemish and un-reproveable before Him." It may be a question whether these words should be connected with "now hath He reconciled," or whether we are to go farther back in the long paragraph, and make them dependent on "it was the good pleasure of the Father." The former seems the more natural—namely, to see here a statement of the great end contemplated in our reconciliation to God; which, indeed, whatever may be the grammatical construction preferred here, is also, of course, the ultimate object of the Father's good pleasure. In the word "present" there is possibly a sacrificial allusion, as there is unquestionably in its use in Romans xii., "Present your bodies a living sacrifice"; or there may be another and even more eloquent metaphor implied, that of the bringing of the bride to the husband by the friend of the bridegroom. That lovely figure is found in two of the instances of the use of the word in Paul's epistles (2 Cor. ii. 2, "to present you as a chaste virgin to Christ," and Eph. v. 27, "that He might present it to Himself a glorious Church"), and possibly in others. It certainly gives an appropriate and beautiful emblem here if we think of the presentation of the bride in virginal beauty and purity to her Lord at that last great day which is the bridal day of the perfected Church.

There is however no need to suppose any metaphor at all, nor any allusion beyond the general meaning of the word—to set in the presence of. The sacrificial reference is incongruous here, and the bridal one not indicated by anything in the context, as it is in the instances just quoted. One thing is clear, that the reference is to a future presentation in the day of judgment, as in another place,

where Paul says, "He . . . shall raise up us also . . . and shall present us" (2 Cor. iv. 14). In the light of that revealing day, His purpose is that we shall stand "holy," that is, devoted to God and therefore pure—"without blemish," as the offerings had to be, and "unreproveable," against whom no charge can be brought. These three express a regular sequence; first, the inward principle of consecration and devotion to God, then its visible issue in stainless conduct and character, and then its last consequence, that in the judgment of God and of men we shall stand acquitted of blame, and every accusation drop away from our dazzling purity, like muddy water from the white wing of the sea-bird as it soars. And all this moral perfectness and unblameableness is to be not merely in the judgment of men, but "before Him," the light of whose "pure eyes and perfect judgment" discovers all stains and evils. They must be spotless indeed who are "without fault before the throne of God."

Such, then, is the grand conception of the ultimate purpose and issue of Christ's reconciling work. All the lines of thought in the preceding section lead up to and converge in this peak. The meaning of God in creation and redemption cannot be fully fathomed without taking into view the future perfecting of men. This Christian ideal of the possibilities for men is the noblest vision that can animate our hopes. Absolute moral purity which shall be recognised as perfect by the perfect Judge, and a close approach to God, so as that we shall be "before Him" in a manner unknown here—are hopes as much brighter than those which any other system of belief prints on the dim canvas curtain of the future, as the Christian estimate of man's condition apart from Christ is sadder and darker than theirs. Christianity has a much more extended scale of colours than they have. It goes further down into blackness for the tints with which it paints man as he is, and further up into flashing glories

of splendour for the gleaming hues with which it paints him as he may become. They move within narrow limits of neutral tints. The Gospel alone does not try to minimise man's evil, because it is triumphantly confident of its power to turn all that evil into good.

Nothing short of this complete purity and blamelessness satisfies God's heart. We may travel back to the beginning of this section, and connect its first words with these, "It pleased the Father," to present us holy and spotless and blameless." It delights Him thus to effect the purifying of sinful souls, and He is glad when He sees Himself surrounded by spirits thus echoing His will and reflecting His light. This is what He longs for. This is what He aims at in all His working—to make good and pure men. The moral interest is uppermost in His heart and in His doings. The physical universe is but the scaffolding by which the true house of God may be built. The work of Christ is the means to that end, and when God has got us, by such lavish expenditure, to be white like Himself, and can find nothing in us to condemn, then, and not till then, does He brood over us satisfied and glad at heart, resting in His love, and rejoicing over us with singing.

Nor will anything short of this complete purity exhaust the power of the Reconciling Christ. His work is like a broken column, or Giotto's Campanile, all shining with marbles and alabasters and set about with fair figures, but waiting for centuries for the glittering apex to gather its glories into a heaven-piercing point. His cross and passion reach no adequate result short of the perfecting of saints, nor was it worth Christ's while to die for any less end. His cross and passion have evidently power to effect this perfect purity, and cannot be supposed to have done all that is in them to do, until they have done that with every Christian.

We ought then to keep very clear before us this as the

crowning object of Christianity: not to make men happy, except as a consequence of holiness; not to deliver from penalty, except as a means to holiness; but, to make them holy, and being holy, to set them close by the throne of God. No man understands the scope of Christianity, or judges it fairly, who does not give full weight to that as its own statement of its purpose. The more distinctly we, as Christians, keep that purpose prominent in our thoughts, the more shall we have our efforts stimulated and guided, and our hopes fed, even when we are saddened by a sense of failure. We have a power working in us which can make us white as the angels, pure as our Lord is pure. If it, being able to produce perfect results, has produced only such imperfect ones, we may well ask, where the reason for the partial failure lies. If we believed more vividly that the real purpose and use of Christianity was to make us good men, we should surely labour more earnestly to secure that end, should take more to heart our own responsibility for the incompleteness with which it has been attained in us, and should submit ourselves more completely to the working of the "might of the power" which worketh in us.

Nothing less than our absolute purity will satisfy God about us. Nothing less should satisfy ourselves. The only worthy end of Christ's work for us is to present us holy, in complete consecration, and without blemish, in perfect homogeneousness and uniformity of white purity, and unproveable in manifest innocence in His sight. Let us make it our life's business to see that that end is being accomplished in us in some tolerable and growing measure, if we call ourselves Christians.

II. We have next set forth the conditions on which the accomplishment of that purpose depends: "If so be that ye continue in the faith, grounded and stedfast, and not moved away from the hope of the Gospel."

The condition is, generally speaking, a stedfast adherence

to the Gospel which they had received. "If ye continue in the faith," means, I suppose, if ye continue to live in the *exercise* of your faith. The word here has its ordinary subjective sense, expressing the act of the believing man, and there is no need to suppose that it has the later ecclesiastical objective sense, expressing the believer's creed, a meaning in which it may be questioned whether the word is ever employed in the New Testament. Then this continuance in the faith is further explained as to its manner, and that first positively, and then negatively. They are to be grounded, or more picturesquely and accurately, "founded," that is, built into a foundation, and therefore "stedfast," as banded into the firm rock, and so partaking of its fixedness. Then, negatively, they are not to be "moved away"; the word by its form conveying the idea, that this is a process which may be continually going on, and in which, by some force constantly acting from without, they may be gradually and imperceptibly pushed off from the foundation—that foundation is the hope evoked or held out by the Gospel, a representation which is less familiar than that which makes the Gospel itself the foundation, but is substantially equivalent to it, though with a different colour.

One or two plain lessons may be drawn from these words. There is an "if," then. However great the powers of Christ and of His work, however deep the desire and fixed the purpose of God, no fulfilment of these is possible except on condition of our habitual exercise of faith. The Gospel does not work on men by magic. Mind, heart and will must be exercised on Christ, or all His power to purify and bless will be of no avail to us. We shall be like Gideon's fleece, dry when the dew is falling thick, unless we are continually putting forth living faith. That attracts the blessing and fits the soul to receive it. There is nothing mystical about the matter. Common sense tells us, that if a man never

thinks about any truth, that truth will do him no good in any way. If it does not find its road into his heart through his mind, and thence into his life, it is all one as if there were no such truth, or as if he did not believe it. If our creed is made up of truths which we do not think about, we may just as well have no creed. If we do not bring ourselves into contact with the motives which the Gospel brings to bear on character, the motives will not mould our character. If we do not, by faith and meditation, realize the principles which flow from the truth as it is in Jesus, and obtain the strength which is stored in Him, we shall not grow by Him or like Him. No matter how mighty be the renewing powers of the Gospel wielded by the Divine Spirit, they can only work on the nature that is brought into contact with and continues in contact with them by *faith*. The measure in which we trust Jesus Christ will be the measure in which He helps us. "He could do no mighty works because of their unbelief." He cannot do what He can do, if we thwart Him by our want of faith. God will present us holy before Him *if* we continue in the faith.

And it must be *present* faith which leads to *present* results. We cannot make an arrangement by which we exercise faith wholesale once for all, and secure a delivery of its blessings in small quantities for a while after, as a buyer may do with goods. The moment's act of faith will bring the moment's blessings; but to-morrow will have to get its own grace by its own faith. We cannot lay up a stock for the future. There must be present drinking for present thirst; we cannot lay in a reserve of the water of life, as a camel can drink at a draught enough for a long desert march. The Rock follows us all through the wilderness, but we have to fill our pitchers day by day. Many Christians seem to think that they can live on past acts of faith. No wonder that their Christian character is stunted,

and their growth stopped, and many a blemish visible, and many a "blame" to be brought against them. Nothing but continual exercise of faith, day by day, moment by moment, in every duty, and every temptation, will secure the continual entrance into our weakness of the strength which makes strong and the purity which makes pure.

Then again, if we and our lives are to be firm and stable, we must have a foundation outside of ourselves on which to rest. That thought is involved in the word "grounded" or "founded." It is possible that this metaphor of the foundation is carried on into the next clause, in which case "the hope of the Gospel" would be the foundation. Strange to make a solid foundation out of so unsubstantial a thing as "hope." That would be indeed to build a castle on the air, a palace on a soap-bubble, would it not? Yes it would, if this hope were not "the hope produced by the Gospel," and therefore as solid as the ever-enduring Word of the Lord on which it is founded. But, more probably, the ordinary application of the figure is preserved here, and Christ is the foundation, the Rock, on which builded, our fleeting lives and our fickle selves may become rock-like too, and every impulsive and changeable Simon Bar Jonas rise to the mature steadfastness of a Peter, the pillar of the Church.

Translate that image of taking Christ for our foundation into plain English, and what does it come to? It means, let our minds find in Him, in His Word, and whole revealing life, the basis of our beliefs, the materials for thought; let our hearts find in Him their object, which brings calmness and unchangeableness into their love; let our practical energies take Him as their motive and pattern, their strength and their aim, their stimulus and their reward; let all hopes and joys, emotions and desires, fasten themselves on Him; let Him occupy and fill our whole nature, and mould and preside over all our actions. So shall we be "founded" on Christ.

And so "founded," we shall, as Paul here beautifully puts it, be "stedfast." Without that foundation to give stability and permanence, we never get down to what abides, but pass our lives amidst fleeting shadows, and are ourselves transient as they. The mind whose thoughts about God and the unseen world are not built on the personal revelation of God in Christ will have no solid certainties which cannot be shaken, but, at the best, opinions which cannot have more fixedness than belongs to human thoughts upon the great problem. If my love does not rest on Christ, it will flicker and flutter, lighting now here and now there, and even where it rests most secure in human love, sure to have to take wing some day when Death with his woodman's axe fells the tree where it nestles. If my practical life is not built on Him, the blows of circumstance will make it reel and stagger. If we are not well joined to Jesus Christ, we shall be driven by gusts of passion and storms of trouble, or borne along on the surface of the slow stream of all-changing time like thistle-down on the water. If we are to be stable, it must be because we are fastened to something outside of ourselves that is stable, just as they have to lash a man to the mast or other fixed things on deck, if he is not to be washed overboard in the gale. If we are lashed to the unchangeable Christ by the "cords of love" and faith, we too shall, in our degree, be stedfast.

And, says Paul, that Christ-derived stedfastness will make us able to resist influences that would move us away from the hope of the Gospel. That process which their stedfastness would enable the Colossians successfully to resist, is described by the language of the Apostle as continuous, and as one which acted on them from without. Intellectual dangers arose in false teachings. The ever acting tendencies of worldliness pressed upon them, and

they needed to make a distinct effort to keep themselves from being pushed off the foundation.

That imperceptible, steady pressure of the all-surrounding worldliness, which is continually acting on us, will push us right off the foundation without our knowing that we have shifted at all, if we do not take care. If we do not look well after our moorings we shall drift away down stream, and never know that we are moving, so smooth is the motion, till we wake up to see that everything round about is changed. Many a man is unaware how completely his Christian faith has gone till some crisis comes when he needs it, and when he opens the jar there is nothing. It has evaporated. When white ants eat away all the inside of a piece of furniture, they leave the outside shell apparently solid, and it stands till some weight is laid upon it, and then goes down with a crash. Many people lose their Christianity in that fashion, by its being nibbled away in tiny flakes by a multitude of secretly working little jaws, and never know that the pith is out of it till they want to lean on it, and then it gives under them.

The only way to keep firm hold of hope is to keep fast on the foundation. If we do not wish to slide imperceptibly away from Him who alone will make our lives steadfast and our hearts calm with the peacefulness of having found our All, we must continuously make an effort to tighten our hold on Him, and resist the subtle forces which, by silent pressure or by sudden blows, seek to get us off the one foundation.

III. Then lastly, we have a threefold motive to adherence to the Gospel.

The three clauses which close these verses seem to be appended as secondary and subordinate encouragements to steadfastness, which encouragements are drawn from certain characteristics of the Gospel. Of course, the main reason for a man's sticking to the Gospel, or to anything

else, is because it is true. And unless we are prepared to say that we believe it true, we have nothing to do with such subordinate motives for professing adherence to it, except to take care that they do *not* influence us. And that one sole reason is abundantly wrought out in this letter. But then, when once it is taken for granted, we may fairly bring in other subsidiary motives to reinforce this, seeing that there may be a certain coldness of belief which needs the warmth of such encouragements.

The first of these lies in the words, "the Gospel, which ye heard." That is to say, the Apostle would have the Colossians, in the face of these heretical teachers, remember the beginning of their Christian life, and be consistent with that. They had heard it at their conversion. He would have them recall what they had heard then, and tamper with no inconsistent teaching. He also appeals to their experience. "Do you remember what the Gospel did for you? Do you remember the time when it first dawned upon your astonished hearts, all radiant with heavenly beauty, as the revelation of a Heart in heaven that cared for you, and of a Christ who, on earth, had died for you? Did it not deliver you from your burden? Did it not set new hope before you? Did it not make earth as the very portals of heaven? And have these truths become less precious because familiar? Be not moved away from the Gospel 'which ye have heard.'"

To us the same appeal comes. This word has been sounding in our ears ever since childhood. It has done everything for some of us, something for all of us. Its truths have sometimes shone out for us like suns, in the dark, and brought us strength when nothing else could sustain us. If they are not truths, of course they will have to go. But they are not to be abandoned easily. They are interwoven with our very lives. To part with them is a resolution not to be lightly undertaken.

The argument of experience is of no avail to convince others, but is valid for ourselves. A man has a perfect right to say, "I have heard Him myself, and I know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world." A Christian may wisely decline to enter on the consideration of many moot questions which he may feel himself incompetent to handle, and rest upon the fact that Christ has saved his soul. The blind man beat the Pharisees in logic when he sturdily took his stand on experience, and refused to be tempted to discuss subjects which he did not understand, or to allow his ignorance to slacken his grasp of what he did know. "Whether this man be a sinner or no, I know not: one thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see." There was no answering that, so they confessed themselves beaten by excommunicating him.

A second encouragement to steadfast adherence to the Gospel lies in the fact that it "was preached in all creation under heaven." We need not be pedantic about literal accuracy, and may allow that the statement has a rhetorical colouring. But what the Apostle means is, that the Gospel had spread so widely, through so many phases of civilization, and had proved its power by touching men so unlike each other in mental furniture and habits, that it had shown itself to be a word for the whole race. It is the same thought as we have already found in verse 6. His implied exhortation is, "Be not moved away from what belongs to humanity by teachings which can only belong to a class. All errors are transient in duration and limited in area. One addresses itself to one class of men, another to another. Each false, or exaggerated, or partial representation of religious truth, is congenial to some group with idiosyncracies of temperament or mind. Different tastes like different spiced meats, but the Gospel, "human nature's daily food," is the bread of God that everybody can relish, and which everybody must have for healthy life. What only

a certain class, or the men of one generation, or of one stage of culture can find nourishment in, cannot be meant for all men. But the great message of God's love in Jesus Christ commends itself to me because it can go into any corner of the world, and there, upon all sorts of people, work its wonders. So I will sit down with the women and children upon the green grass, and eat of *it*, however fastidious people whose appetites have been spoiled by high-spiced meat, may find it coarse and insipid. It would feed them too, if they would try—but whatever they may do, let us take it as more than our necessary food.

The last of these subsidiary encouragements to steadfastness lies in, "whereof I Paul was made a minister." This is not merely an appeal to their affection for him, though that is perfectly legitimate. Holy words may be holier because dear lips have taught them to us, and even the truth of God may allowably have a firmer hold upon our hearts because of our love for some who have ministered it to us. It is a poor commentary on a preacher's work if, after long service to a congregation, his words do not come with power given to them by old affection and confidence. The humblest teacher who has done his Master's errand will have some to whom he can appeal as Paul did, and urge them to keep hold of the message which he has preached.

But there is more than that in the Apostle's mind. He was accustomed to quote the fact that he, the persecutor, had been made the messenger of Christ, as a living proof of the infinite mercy and power of that ascended Lord, whom his eyes saw on the road to Damascus. So here, he puts stress on the fact that he *became* a minister of the Gospel, as being an "evidence of Christianity." The history of his conversion is one of the strongest proofs of the resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ. You know, he seems to say, what turned me from being a persecutor into an apostle.

It was because I saw the living Christ, and "heard the words of His mouth," and, I beseech you, listen to no words which make His dominion less sovereign, and His sole and all sufficient work on the cross less mighty as the only power that knits earth to heaven.

So the sum of this whole matter is—abide in Christ. Let us root and ground our lives and characters in Him, and then God's inmost desire will be gratified in regard to us, and He will bring even us stainless and blameless into the blaze of His presence. There we shall all have to stand, and let that all penetrating light search us through and through. How do we expect to be then "found of Him in peace, without spot and blameless"? There is but one way—to live in constant exercise of faith in Christ, and grip Him so close and sure that the world, the flesh and the devil cannot make us loosen our fingers. Then He will hold us up, and His great purpose, which brought Him to earth, and nailed Him to the cross, will be fulfilled in us, and at last, we shall lift up voices of wondering praise "to Him who is able to keep us from falling, and to present us faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy."

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

A CRITICAL ESTIMATE.

FIRST PAPER.

A NOTED judicial dictum lately vested the censorship of literature and art in the general British public. We think the modern tribunal is likely to find far more "artistic merit" in the O.T.¹ Revisers than in their *confrères* of the

¹ The following abbreviations will be used in these papers: N.T. for New Testament; O.T. for Old Testament; A.V. for the "Authorized Version" of

New Dispensation. The Hebrew text has been left in its original state of questionable integrity. Obscure passages for the most part remain as unintelligible as the lover of "that sweet word Mesopotamia" can desire. The alterations admitted in the translation do but little affect, what the *Standard* calls the "music of the Bible," meaning that of King James' translators. These, we are told, are strong points in favour of the Revised O.T. with our "Bible-loving" people. We believe it, and fear it will be long before their aspirations are of a higher sort.

The thoughtful (and perhaps equally "Bible-loving") student would probably rather have this matter of translation severed from the causes of sentimentality and modern pietism. For him there is no *prima facie* reason why a translator of ancient literature in 1885 should idolize the diction of a translator of 1611. The one thing needful is that these Hebrew and Greek writings should convey to us as near as may be the sense they conveyed to their first readers. Determinedly therefore he puts out of court alike the issues of subsequent history and the prejudices of Churches and sects. He demands the plain truth although cherished texts go overboard, and for perspicuity he will pay even the price of a verbose paraphrase. If any existent grandeur or rhythmical beauty in the original can be reproduced, it is a point gained, but the *caveat* is paramount, that there be no sacrifice of fidelity.

We scarcely need go further to show that in our thinking the Companies of Revisers attempted the impossible. The scholars who met in the Jerusalem Chamber were fitted for a nobler task than tinkering up the Version of 1611 for the populace, under the restrictions of the Canterbury House of Convocation. Many educated persons desire an accurate

1611; R.V. for the new Revised Version; LXX. for the Septuagint Translation of 285 B.C. (?); Vulg. for Jerome's Vulgate Version, cir. 405 A.D. We use square brackets [] in preference to italics for the parts of a translation not in the original.

and intelligible translation of both Scriptures in bold English, without any unnecessary tinge of archaism. Never was there a better opportunity for producing it. The religious world desired merely an authoritative emendation of the worst mistranslations in the A.V. It would have been but a few weeks' work to effect it. Between the two stools the Revisers could not but fall. Their alterations will, to a large extent, remain "caviare to the general." The timorous conservatism of their O.T. will vex those who desired a translation on a level with modern erudition. Their pigeon-Jacobean diction in both O.T. and N.T. will always provoke disparaging comparison with the easy rhythm of our great English classic. The one permanently valuable outcome of this singular episode in the history of literature is Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament text, which is recognised by Continental critics as a credit to English scholarship.

This brings us to the first point in our survey of the O.T. Company's labours. The task of *textual* emendation they have frankly declined. Palpable misreadings remain. Conjectural emendation is not admitted, and the witness of the LXX. and other Versions to a different text in all but a few cases finds expression only in a side-note, which is of course valueless where the book is read aloud, and which may not always be printed. These side-notes, we may remark, generally suggest that the Company did not quite know its own mind. So far as they concern translation, they doubtless often indicate what the more scholarly minority would have put in the Version. Often, however, they are quite unnecessary. Of this more anon. The Preface tells us that our knowledge is "not at present such as to justify any attempt at an entire reconstruction of the text on the authority of the Versions." "In some few instances" (which might have been tabulated) "a reading has been adopted on the authority of the Ancient Versions":

but the broad rule is—servile adhesion to the Massoretic text, and to the vowel-points. Here and there the “Kri” or Massoretic emendation rightly finds a place in the translation, as in Isa. ix. 3; xxx. 32; Ps. c. 3. But these emendations were of course familiar to every Hebraist, and the English reader could have found them in the A.V. margin. The Revisers thus assume quite a different standpoint from the other Company, which gave to the world, not a new translation only, but a new Greek Testament. In this regard the Revised N.T. is on a level with the scholarship of the day; the Revised O.T. is not.

It is only fair to admit that in this matter of textual criticism the responsibilities of the two Companies scarcely bear comparison. King James’ Version of the N.T. was taken from MSS. of small value and comparatively late date, and newly acquired access to the great uncial Codices rendered a revision of the Greek Text imperative. The O.T. perforce stands on a different footing. Its case stands thus. All our MSS. aim at giving with scrupulous accuracy the text of consonants finally determined by the Massoretes. Who were the Massoretes? The traditional account of them may be expressed in the words of Jehudah hal-Levi. “There were hundreds of thousands of them, generation after generation, for ever so many years, and the time of their commencement is not known to us.” Less partial writers are content with the view that certain Rabbis of Tiberias, cir. 500 A.D., effected a scrupulously exact recension of the Hebrew Bible, and that these were those Massoretes to whom the text owes its pretensions to finality. *Massora* only means “tradition.” We may of course imagine that “scribes” and “lawyers,” from the time of Ezra onwards, carefully guarded the Scripture text and its “traditional” variations of reading. But on this point nothing is known.¹ Nor do we know how the “wise

¹ We should add that the Talmudists (dating perhaps from the 3rd century

men of Tiberias" (who are the persons we shall henceforth mean when we use this vague term Massoretes) proceeded, or whether their work was conservative or critical in character. It was at least sufficiently laborious. Every verse, every letter, was counted; and the numeration remains preserved by the aid of a *memoria technica*. The vowel-points were added somewhat later, and have less pretension to sacrosanctity. Two systems of vowels were devised. The Babylonian survives in the Codex Petropolitanus of A.D. 916. That of Tiberias, which has entirely superseded the other, exists (perhaps has been inserted) in the less known Cambridge MS. *Mn.* 5. 27, which claims the early date 7th of Adar, A.D. 856. But MSS. may go to the winds in this problem of textual criticism. The original Massoretic text may be got by their aid, but what then? It is a far cry from cir. 500 A.D. to the dates of even the latest O.T. writers.

Ancient Versions—Greek, Chaldee, and Latin—take us much nearer to the O.T. times. For instance there is the LXX. which may have been begun in 285 B.C. But as the Revisers hint, much remains to be done before we can say with precision what text the LXX. translators had before them. Sometimes a variation is in one MS. of the LXX., not in another. Sometimes it may be deemed a late critical emendation. Why, we ask here, did not some of the Company work out a scholarly recension of the LXX. with a full account of the state of each book? It is not likely we shall ever have better material: the occasion was suitable; and the men were not wanting.

To cut our argument short,—in the textual criticism of the O.T. we are thrown back to an unusual degree on internal evidences, and the dictates of common sense. Conjecture suggests that the Massoretes did their work *more Judaico*—

A.D.) have many of the *lectiones defectivæ*, etc., afterwards stereotyped by the Massoretes. The O.T. text as quoted in the Talmud agrees in the main with that of the Massoretes.

that they were no critics, but merely servile copyists of a text already corrupt in some places. Ought we to retain these corruptions when they are palpable, when moreover, as is sometimes the case, the LXX. or Targum indicates a preferable text. The Revisers say "Yes," but they speak half-heartedly. "The time is not ripe," they hint. But when will it be? In this regard, that absence of fixed scholarly principle which is the inherent vice of Committee-work, becomes noticeable. The Revisers are not wholly against emendation; *e.g.* in Ps. lix. 9, they rely on the Greek versions, and boldly and rightly alter the Massoretic עֵי, "his strength," to עֵי, "my strength." But in other passages where emendation is quite as necessary, and where it has equally authoritative sanction, the old text is retained without comment.

Here are some of the emendations¹ for which we claim a moral certainty. They would be admitted, we think, by all Hebraists not working under the tutelage of the "Revision Committee of Convocation," and we deeply regret that this opportunity of giving them a sanction has been neglected.

Lev. xi. 14, proscribes the eating of *two* birds, the "kite" רָאָה, and the "falcon" אֵיָהּ. But the law in Deut. xiv. 13 gives *three* birds, *i.e.* it includes with the "falcon" and the "kite" (here spelt רִיָּה), what the A.V. and R.V. agree to call the "glede." The Hebrew is רָאָה. This word is wanting in the Samaritan Codex and LXX., and but for this passage it would be unknown to the Hebrew language. In view of the misleading similarity of רִיָּה and רִיָּה is not its origin plain? A scribe noticed the divergent spelling רִיָּה and wrote at the side of his MS. an explanatory רָאָה. It was easy for a later scribe to misread the word as רָאָה, and

¹ In these passages we retain the R.V. translations. We of course take no notice of its side-notes, which we cannot allow to discount the final decision the Revisers lay before the public in their text. By that they must stand or fall. In most of these passages, however, the side-notes say nothing to our purpose.

incorporate it in the text as a third unclean bird. We are convinced the most lax of Jews never infringed the Torah by eating a *ראה*.

In Joshua ix. 12, the Gibeonites who gained compassion by artifice use the verb *הצטיר*, "took for provision." This verb-form occurs nowhere else; but is quite unimpeachable, since the cognate substantive denoting "provision" occurs in vv. 5, 14. But in v. 1, we have a verb *הצטיר*, otherwise unknown. The R.V. says that the Gibeonites "made as if they had been ambassadors." We need scarcely claim our support here from the LXX., Targum, and Vulgate. Plainly *ו* and *ר* have again been confounded. The verb of verse 12 should be substituted, and the rendering "took provision for themselves" given.

1 Sam. xvii. 12. The text gives an expression strange to Hebrew usage: "the man *came among men* (*בא באנשים*) for an old man in the days of Saul." Eliding one letter we have an ordinary idiom: Jesse "was in the days of Saul an old man *stricken in years* (*בא בשנים*)."
Here we notice the characteristic half-heartedness of the R.V. Probably the absurd rule requiring a majority of two-thirds of the quorum prohibited a straightforward textual emendation. Yet there was a wish to give the true meaning. So we have (without comment), "the man was an old man in the days of Saul, *stricken* [in years] *among men*," which we hold to be an impossible rendering of the Massoretic text.

2 Sam. vi. 5. David and the Israelites play before the Lord "on all manner of [instruments made of] *fir wood*." The expression is strange; "on all *fir trees*" would be the literal meaning of *בכל עצי ברושים*. But the parallel passage, 1 Chron. xiii. 8, has in lieu thereof, *בכל עז ובשירים*, "with all their might, even with songs." This is clearly the true, the other the corrupted text. Similarly David, a few verses afterwards, dances before the Lord *בכל עז*, "with all his might."

2 Sam. viii. 13 wrongly states that it was the "Syrians" (אֲרָם) who were defeated in the Valley of Salt. In 1 Chron. xviii. 12 and Ps. lx., title, it is the "Edomites" (אֲדָמִים). Edom was defeated in the same locality (which was probably on its borders) by Amaziah, 2 Kings xiv. The fact that there was a contemporaneous war with Syria has, we know, suggested an elaborate emendation here, to include both nationalities. But we hold there is no other mistake than the familiar confusion of ו and ׀, and we have the LXX. on our side. But at all events scholars are agreed that it was Edom who was defeated in the Valley of Salt, not Syria. Why should the R.V. perpetuate a historical blunder?

2 Sam. ix. 11, illustrates the common confusion of the letters ו and ׀. It is hopeless to invent the words ["said the king"] in order to give sense to שִׁלְחֵנִי, "*my table*." Read שִׁלְחֵנִי, and all is plain. Mephibosheth "was eating at *his table* as one of the king's sons." So LXX. "at David's table."

Considering the state of the text of Samuel, we marvel that the R.V. does not even notice the LXX.'s reading in xxiv. 13, which makes the story agree with 1 Chron. xxi. 12. There is no proof it is an emendation; and if it be, it is a good one. The story in the archetypal copy was doubtless that David had the choice of *three* years' famine, three months' war or three days' pestilence. The symmetry of the alternatives is obvious, and the reading "*seven* years' famine" in Samuel may be due to the corruption of the numeral ׀ to ו. Perhaps the tradition of the "*seven* years' famine" in Joseph's days facilitated the error.

2 Sam. xxiv. 23, should certainly run, "All these things did Araunah give unto the king." The attempts to deal with הַמֶּלֶךְ ("as a king," A.V., "O king," R.V.) are futile. LXX. and Vulg. have it nct, and it is plainly an interpolation. Doubtless לַמֶּלֶךְ was written twice by some careless

scribe, and המלך was a subsequent bad emendation, of the kind noticed in Deut. xiv. 13.

At the end of Ps. xlviii. the R.V. retains "He will be our guide [even] unto death." Hebraists have yet to learn that by any straining על מות can mean "unto death." It is plain that LXX. and Targum read the one word עלמות which survives in some MSS. Both versions failed however to give a satisfactory account of this word, which indeed cannot be treated as an integral part of the verse. It is doubtless the same musical sign that we have in Pss. ix., xli., and the meaning is simply "on maiden voices," or "*soprano*." The poem thus ends with the words "He it is that shall guide us." As Pss. xli.-xlviii. probably celebrate one and the same victory, it is natural that the triplet has the same musical sign at beginning and end.

In all these passages we think an unfettered translator would emend the text, noting the Massoretic reading as a corruption. Equally useful emendations should be made elsewhere, *e.g.* in Ps. xxv. 17; Isa. v. 17; Exod. vii. 16. There are also numerous corruptions of names and numbers to which we may allude hereafter. But we must now pass to another phase of the question. How should variant recensions of a speech or poem be treated? The R.V. leaves them as they stand; and perhaps a translation of higher aim would do the same, save where the text gave mere nonsense. This question however is of a very suggestive character, and its study scarcely tends to increase our faith in the Massoretic text. The most noted duplicate recensions are those of David's poem in 2 Sam. xxii. and Ps. xviii. Ps. liii. is also a duplicate of Ps. xiv., and Pss. lvii. lx., are interwoven in the single piece Ps. cviii. We have also two recensions of the prayer of Hezekiah and Isaiah's answer (2 Kings xix.; Isa. xxxvii.).

Now comparing such duplicates, we find variations. Sometimes they may be deemed intentional. But the

merest tyro can often see that they are due to a confusion of letters originating in similarity of shape or sound. Thus, comparing 2 Sam. xxii. and the Psalter's recension of the same poem, we find the following suggestive divergences—וירא “and was seen,” וידא “and did fly”; השרת מים “gathering of waters”, חשקת מים “darkness of waters”; ים “sea”, מים “waters”; ויתן דרכו “and guideth in his way”, ויתן דרכי “and maketh my way”; אדקם “stamp them”, אריקם “cast them out”; תשמרני “hast kept me”, תשימני “hast made me.” It is far out of our province to reconstruct the original text of this poem: we only point out that in all the cases we have cited one of the two variants is *certainly wrong*. The shock of finding the text so manifestly unsettled in a case where we have the rare advantage of a duplicate recension is to some extent lessened by the fact that 2 Samuel is exceptionally corrupt. The variations of Pss. xiv., liii., on the other hand, may be considered for the most part intentional. But the theory of intention cannot apply to such obvious “itacisms” as מצור and מבצר, in the corresponding vv. of Pss. lx., cviii. Nor, if we compare the duplicate accounts of Hezekiah's trouble, can we justify מלון, שרפה, and סחיש in 2 Kings xix. for מרום, שרמה, and שחים in Isa. xxxvii. Again, a critical conjecture is provoked in Jer. xlvi. 45, where the prophet incorporates two poetical passages from Numbers. For in Num. xxiv. 17 we have ויקר כל בני שת, “And break down all the sons of tumult,” but in Jer. xlvi. 45, שאן ויקר בני, “and the crown of the head of the tumultuous ones.” Our suspicion is strengthened when we find that the Samaritan Codex reads ויקר in Num. xxiv. This was probably the reading current in Jeremiah's day. Translating שת, “tumult,” as R.V. rightly, for “Sheth” of A.V., we have a text in Num. xxiv. sufficiently similar to the Prophet's loose quotation.

But as we have already said, the Revisers were perhaps justified in leaving such passages uncorrected. The

duplicates can be compared ; a good sense is given in each case ; and a corruption in a poem or speech stands on a somewhat different footing from one in a narrative of fact. It is difficult to press this distinction : it might of course be asked, Is not prophecy historical rather than oratorical ? We will not here attempt a line of demarcation. We can only say that we could tolerate the retention of the variants just given with a note indicating their divergence, but that we absolutely resent the conservatism of the Revisers in the passages first enumerated. If this matter is looked at from the Canterbury Convocation's point of view, the fact presses that certain historical books of the O. T. are much read in social strata where the critical faculty is non-existent. Take the cases of David's alternatives of punishment, and of the battle in the Valley of Salt. For one person of this sort who will read the less interesting narrative of the Chronicler, ten will learn the corrupt account of 2 Samuel. Again, wisely or unwisely, the young in elementary schools are incited to "cram" such books as Samuel for diocesan or other examinations. The R.V. text will of course be regarded in such quarters as the highest flight of scholarship. Henceforward therefore, the historical inaccuracies alluded to will boast a kind of academical *imprimatur*. Those who are informed of them will wrongly conceive a low idea of the Revisers' qualifications.

The principles accepted by the Revisers in the matter of translation will be treated of hereafter. Our remaining space must be devoted to their general plan of arrangement. First we notice that the Titles of the Books, their sequence, and the division of Chapters, are exactly as in the Version of 1611. The requirements of the public demanded this, and there was nothing to be urged against it. The Titles—taken originally from the LXX.—are sufficiently appropriate. The arrangement of Books corresponds neither with any of the Hebrew divisions, nor with that of the

LXX. But it too is unimpeachable. Its threefold division is easily remembered and is less artificial than that of the Hebrew Bible, with its inexplicable *N'biim* and *C'thoobim*. With regard to Chapters, those in the Hebrew Bible do not always correspond with those of our A.V. But the true Jewish division is really quite a different one, and the "capitular" arrangement is of no antiquity. Cardinal Hugo de Santo Caro (cir. 1248), devised the chapters; in later times the Jews adopted them for controversial purposes. In our opinion the Jewish deviations are generally changes for the worse. Certainly in Isa. ix. and Job xli. the English capitular division is preferable. The verse-division, on the other hand, is purely Jewish, and is at least as old as the Massorettes. For its questionable reproduction in the N. T. we are indebted to the great editor Robert Stephens (1551). Apropos of verses, we notice with approval that our Revisers reproduce their metrical form in poetical passages.

While on this subject of arrangement, we notice two archaisms we would fain away with. First—Why should the English Bible and Prayer-Book remain the only works in which when a pronoun is used referring to God, it is *not* distinguished by a capital letter? Can it be that these publications remain behind the penny papers in point of reverence, from mere deference to the printers' usage in the sixteenth century? But our challenge is not on the point of reverence, but of perspicuity. In innumerable passages, were "Thy" printed for "thy," "His" for "his," etc., the uninitiated would understand what is now very obscure. Secondly—(to borrow the N.T. Revisers' own words on the verse question), "let any one consider for a moment the injurious effect that would be produced in some great standard work" by never using *inverted commas* for speeches and quotations. We might descant long on the great inconvenience these two *ἀρχαῖα ἔθνη* cause. Take the Song of Solomon—what uninstructed reader of the A. V. ever

succeeded in distinguishing the speeches? Nay, did not two noted scholars not along ago publish a mystical Commentary in which the words of the bride went into the mouth of the bridegroom, and *vice versa*? The fact that the Hebrew 2nd person has two genders of course differentiates the speeches in the actual book. The use of the sign “ ” would be bare justice to the perspicuity of the original. The strophe-arrangement of the R.V. in this particular book is a great boon, but even now there is danger of misunderstanding. The sign ‘ ’ should of course distinguish citations within a speech, and words put into another’s mouth. This would be of special service to many readers in the Book of Job, where by the way we notice one colloquy as wholly obscured to all but students for want of the inverted commas and capital letters. We mean the final dialogue of Jehovah and Job in xlii. 2-6. Similarly Hosea xiv. 8 is admitted to be a colloquy between Jehovah and Israel. How many clergymen read it as such? Were it printed thus in the R.V. all would see its signification,—Ephraim shall say, “What have I to do any more with idols?” “I have answered, and will regard him.” “I am like a green fir tree.” “From Me is thy fruit found.”—Again in Ps. ii. 12, commentators agree that it is Jehovah, not the “anointed,” whose wrath is threatened. This would be plain, had we “He” and “His,” for “he” and “his.”

We suppose the Revisers were to some extent hampered by the other Company’s treatment of such details; and here—to close this paper—we notice that the system of indicating quotations from the O.T. adopted by the N.T. Revisers was inexcusably bad. A needless pedantry marks “the metrical divisions of the Hebrew original;” yet if we look at the Revised O.T. (where if anywhere they should be marked), they are only indicated in the poetical passages. Worse still, this system is only pursued when the quotation extends to two lines. Thus, single-line quotations have to

be beaten up by the student ; while the more lengthy ones stand out like citations from a ballad-book. Worse yet, those indirect citations, so dear to all writers reared in Jewish modes of thought, are not indicated at all. We would venture a wager that ninety-nine out of a hundred educated Christians have yet to learn that the following originates in the Old Covenant, not in the Gospel—"If thine enemy hunger, feed him ; if he thirst, give him drink : for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head " (Prov. xxv. 21, 22 ; Rom. xii. 20). A like ignorance prevails in the matter of the saying, "Ye are a royal priesthood, a holy nation " (1 Pet. iii. 9). This we know to be used by polemical text-mongers as if overthrowing the Roman theory of an official hierarchy. They would probably be surprised to find that it comes from the Law of Moses (Exod. xix. 6). These interesting links between the two Covenants remain obscured to the public by a silly prejudice against adopting in a translated Bible the convenient usages of modern literature. To give another instance from the Revised N. T., the questionable alteration of "charity" to "love" might gain some adherents were it indicated that "love covereth all sins" stood long ago in the A. V. of Prov. x. 12 ; in fact that 1 Pet. iv. 8, is a loose citation, not an original Apostolic precept.

A. C. JENNINGS.

W. H. LOWE.

THE RESTORATION OF ORDER IN A CHURCH THREATENED WITH DISSOLUTION.

FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

NEARLY two years had passed since the Apostle Paul had vindicated the cause of Christian liberty in Galatia (early

¹ Written for the *EXPOSITOR* by Professor Godet, and translated by Mrs. Harwood-Holmden.

in the year 55), when at the Passover season, 57, toward the close of his ministry in Ephesus, he was led by circumstances of unusual gravity to write the letter which has come down to us in the canon of the New Testament as the First Epistle to the Corinthians. It is generally supposed that this letter was followed a few months later by that known to us as the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. We shall show that a very much longer interval must have elapsed between the two letters.

But however this may be, the two writings are closely linked together by the subjects of which they treat. Both bring vividly before us the most violent crisis through which the work of St. Paul had to pass. The Church of Corinth was the most brilliant crown of his labour, but it was also that which he had the greatest difficulty in defending against the inroads of moral evil and the attacks of his adversaries.

The first Epistle brings before us the commencement of the struggle; the second, its happy issue. Between the two intervened days of anguish, such as the Apostle never experienced in any other stage of his history. Hence in no other of his letters do we get such an insight into his deepest feelings—the warmth of his heart, the keenness of his intellect; in a word, into his whole idiosyncrasy. Just what the great rifts in the earth's surface are to the geologist, revealing to him its hidden depths, such are to us these two epistles, in which with emotion long repressed (in the first letter), but at length finding vent (in the second), he lays bare to the Church of all ages the recesses of his spiritual life.

But it is not the Apostle alone whom we here learn to know as nowhere beside. It is also the primitive Church in the early manifestation of its new life and creative power, and at the same time in its early errors and the experiences of its tumultuous youth.

In Galatia we saw the Gospel striving to break the weary yoke of Mosaic observances by the introduction of a spiritual Christianity. At Corinth, on the other hand, we see the new religion at issue with the license of the Greek spirit, and find the Apostle enforcing the principles of Christian discipline necessary to regulate these wills so impatient of all control. If after eighteen centuries we are able to realize vividly to ourselves what was the life of the Church in the days of the Apostles, we owe it primarily to these two letters. The German *savant* Weizsäcker was therefore justified when he spoke of them as "a fragment which has no parallel in ecclesiastical history."

An interest of a secondary nature attaches moreover to the first of these writings. Through the circumstances of the case, the Apostle was led to treat in it of a number of heterogeneous subjects. We know how acute is his logic when he has one question before him for discussion, when he has to sound and analyse one subject, to demonstrate or refute one thesis. Of this we have an example in the Epistle to the Galatians, and we shall come to one even more remarkable in the Epistle to the Romans. But when he sat down to dictate his First Epistle to the Corinthians, he had before him nine subjects, all of them important, all except one of a practical nature, and all wholly distinct. Will he be able to bind all these together in one connected chain of argument? or will he for once abandon logic? Were he to do this, Paul would be no longer Paul; and we shall find it a task of no small interest to trace the skill with which he classifies and connects subjects so widely differing.

I.

The city of Corinth, "one of the glories and lights" of ancient Greece, had been destroyed by the Romans about two centuries before the time when the Apostle visited

it. Already for more than a century it had been rebuilt. Inhabited largely by foreign settlers, among whom were a number of Romans, as well as by the descendants of the old Greek population, and possessing also a Jewish colony, it had rapidly risen to great prosperity, like those cities of the United States which have grown in the course of a few years from mere villages to huge emporiums of commerce.

It has been calculated that Corinth was, in the time of St. Paul, a league and a half in circumference, and had a population of from six to seven hundred thousand inhabitants, of whom two hundred thousand were freemen and the rest slaves. This rapid development was due to its privileged position on the isthmus which separates the *Ægean* from the *Ionian Sea*, and to its two harbours, *Cenchreae*, by which it had free communication with *Asia*, and *Lechæum*, whence its ships sailed westward. In addition to the extensive commerce secured to Corinth by this unique position, it had various industries. Nor was it lacking in the culture of the fine arts and in the wisdom of the Greeks. It had its schools of rhetoric and philosophy, and it was its boast that no one could walk along any street in Corinth without encountering a sage. In spite of all this wisdom and culture, however, the morals of the city were notoriously corrupt. The temple of *Venus*, which crowned the citadel, was a sort of monument of the vices of the city. The expression, "to live like a Corinthian," had become a proverb through the whole of Greece.

Into the midst of this brilliant but dissolute city the message of salvation was suddenly carried at the close of the year 52. Let us picture to ourselves a man of about fifty years of age, in the garb of an artisan, entering this busy city, and going through its streets in search of a workshop where he may earn his daily bread. Who could have imagined that this man, apparently so insignificant, carried

with him the leaven which was to infuse new life into that whole mass of moral corruption?

St. Paul was not long in finding a fellow worker with whom he could carry on his business. This was a Jew named Aquila, lately come from Rome with his wife Priscilla. They received the Gospel from the lips of the working man who had come to lodge with them, and from that time they were his faithful co-workers in the great cause to which he had devoted his life. It has been said that Aquila was already a Christian when he came from Rome to Corinth; but the text of the Acts is opposed to this assertion, which is often advanced only in order to prove the Judæo-Christian character of the Roman Church in its origin. For about two years Paul carried on his business as a tent-maker and his apostolic ministry side by side. He began by preaching Christ in the Jewish synagogue, as his custom was. "To the Jew first, afterwards to the Greek," he himself said in his Epistle to the Romans (Rom. i. 16). After some time he had the joy of welcoming two of his fellow-labourers, Silas and Timotheus, whom he had left behind or sent back to Macedonia, to visit and strengthen the Churches recently founded in that province. Encouraged by the presence of his two friends, he redoubled his preaching labours, till his adversaries became so exasperated that he was compelled to retire with his adherents into a neighbouring house belonging to one of them, in order there to carry on his work more peaceably.¹

In the First Epistle to the Corinthians he himself describes how he felt at this trying time. "I was with you," he says, "in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling" (chap. ii. 3). When speaking to the Jews he was wont to take his stand upon the writings and prophecies of the Old Testament. Now in addressing the Greeks, lovers of

¹ See Acts xviii. 1 (and fol.).

wisdom and eloquence, one would think he might be tempted to attract them by more elaborate forms of oratory and by the profundities of speculative philosophy; but the severe and holy simplicity of the Cross forbade him to have recourse to such methods. He stood therefore all unequipped before those curious Greeks who came to hear him, and in preaching to them nothing but Christ crucified he had to rely solely on the "power and demonstration of the Spirit," with which God might be pleased to accompany the message.

Nevertheless a great multitude of believers joined themselves to him. Among them were "not many wise men, not many mighty, not many noble" (chap. i. 26, etc.), but hearts broken by a sense of sin, who found in Christ crucified "the wisdom of God and the power of God."

Thus passed the two years which the Apostle spent at Corinth, in the midst of the perpetual conflicts and crosses which he enumerates in Acts xviii., and in consequence of which, shortly before Pentecost (54), he departed for Jerusalem and Antioch, leaving behind him the largest and most flourishing Church he had yet founded.

We have substantial grounds for placing the composition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians three years later, towards the close of St. Paul's stay in Ephesus, in the spring of 57. Indeed, it is from Ephesus that he writes. This is evident from what he says (1 Cor. xvi. 8), "But I will tarry at Ephesus till Pentecost"; and also from verse 19 of the same chapter: "the Churches of Asia salute you." The note appended to this Epistle in the old version, "This Epistle was written from Philippi," arises from a misunderstanding of the expression, "When I shall pass through Macedonia, for I do pass through Macedonia" (chap. xvi. 5). This expression, "I pass," has been taken to express present facts while really it only indicates the plan of St. Paul's proposed journey.

As to the time when this letter was written, that is indicated by the following facts. Paul has with him Apollos, who came to join him at Ephesus, after having visited Corinth (Acts xvi. 12). Now this Alexandrine teacher was only converted by Priscilla and Aquila (at Ephesus) in the course of the year 54. After that he had gone with letters of commendation from them to Corinth, where his ministry had been very effective (Acts xviii. 24-28), and he had then returned to Ephesus. All this must have occupied a considerable time, say, two years at the least. We arrive at a still more exact date if we remember that towards the close of his stay at Ephesus St. Paul resolved to transfer his ministry from the East to the West, and that in preparation for this great change he sent two of his helpers, Timotheus and Erastus, into Greece, to visit the Churches there (Acts xix. 22). This voyage of Timotheus into Macedonia and Achaia is twice mentioned in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. From these passages we learn that Paul wrote after the departure of Timothy for Greece, but that his letter was intended to reach Corinth before that young disciple, doubtless because the letter would go direct by sea from Ephesus to Corinth, while Timothy made a northerly circuit, passing through Macedonia. This coincidence clearly fixes the date of our Epistle. It must have been written about the close of Paul's sojourn at Ephesus, shortly before Pentecost, in the year 54 (1 Cor. xvi. 8). These conclusions are confirmed by what the Apostle says at the beginning of chapter xvi., with reference to the collection made in all the Churches for the poor saints at Jerusalem. We see from the two chapters which the Apostle devotes to this subject in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (chaps. viii., ix.), and from the reference to it in the Romans (chap. xv. 26-33), that he had resolved to make this the closing act of his ministry in the East; and it was doubtless with a view to stirring up the bene-

volence of the Churches that, as we have already observed, he had sent Erastus and Timotheus into Greece.

Three years then had not passed away since St. Paul left Corinth when he wrote the first canonical Epistle to that Church. What had been transpiring in that time? and what were the circumstances which led him to write in such a strain?

II

The first important event had been the arrival of the brilliant Alexandrine teacher Apollos. We are told in the Acts of the Apostles (chap. xviii. 27, 28), that having been commended to the Church of Corinth by Aquila and Priscilla, he "helped them much which had believed through grace: for he powerfully confuted the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ." By his oratorical gifts and his knowledge of the Scriptures Apollos led many of the Jews into the faith, and gathered around him a considerable party in the Church. The admiration of which he became the object was no doubt accompanied, on the part of some, by invidious comparisons with the true founder of the Church. The devoted friends of Paul were hurt at this, and took occasion to assert very emphatically their preference for the great Apostle who had brought them out of darkness into light. This rivalry would have been comparatively unimportant but for an element of a graver nature which was soon introduced. Did the Apostle Peter himself come to Corinth? This seems scarcely probable, for his ministry among the Jews in the East kept him fully employed for a long time in that region; but we know that Christians of Jewish extraction, living in Gentile lands, continued to attend the yearly feasts at Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 20-22). Many Christians from Corinth would no doubt do this, and would thus have the opportunity of meeting the

Apostle Peter, of hearing his accounts of the life of the Lord, and seeing the fruits of his labours. Nothing could be more natural than that they should form an ardent attachment to him personally, and draw a comparison between him and St. Paul, to the disadvantage of the latter. Now Peter continued to observe the ordinances of Moses, while Paul attached very little importance to the old ritual. Those who on this account preferred Peter to Paul would not intend to make the Mosaic ordinances binding on Gentile Christians. Peter himself did not do this. They simply followed in the track of the Apostle Peter, observing the law of Moses themselves, without binding the same yoke upon the Gentile believers.

Nevertheless it appears that there were at Corinth other members of the Judaising party, who, on what they considered to be the authority of Christ Himself, went further, not only than Paul or Apollos, but even than Peter. In reply to those who said, "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas," there were some who had the boldness to say, "And I of Christ" (1 Cor. i. 12). One is fain to ask by what right they dared make such a claim, to the exclusion of the rest. Did they pretend that by vision or direct inspiration they were under the special guidance of the glorified Master, and thus had equal authority with the Apostles, or might even place themselves above them? It would rather seem, from some passages in the Second Epistle, that this group of Christians was in connection with emissaries sent from Jerusalem, who pretended to have known the Lord during His life on earth, and to possess higher illumination as to His person and work than either St. Peter or St. Paul. From these passages, and from the place which St. Paul assigns to these men in the enumeration of the four parties, we gather that they must have formed, so to speak, the extreme right of the Judaising party. Taking their stand on the example of

Christ, who had observed the law to the very end, and on such sayings of His as these, "I am not come to destroy the law, but to fulfil," and, "Ye have one Master, even Christ," they protested against the concessions made to Paul by the Twelve with regard to the Gentile converts, and sought to nullify them by establishing among the Gentiles a sort of Christianity compatible with the Jewish monopoly, which they would maintain at all costs. These people had gained access to the Corinthian Church, and there formed the fourth party, which said, "I am of Christ."

We see at once how melancholy a change had passed over the Church of Corinth since the Apostle's departure. But this was not the only danger to which this community, once so flourishing, was exposed. The levity of the Greeks, checked for a time by the seriousness of the Gospel and by the presence of Paul, had again asserted itself in many of the Christians. The love of money, impurity of life, a return to heathenish festivals, were all endangering the work of God. Some even dared to justify themselves by Paul's favourite maxim, embodying the principle of Christian liberty on indifferent matters, "All things are lawful for me" (1 Cor. vi. 12), and made this a cloak for licentiousness. Those who were not carried away with these errors asked themselves what was the right course to pursue under such circumstances. There had already been an interchange of letters on the subject. The Apostle had replied, to the question put to him, that there must be no association with those who conducted themselves in this manner. The Corinthians had replied that in that case they must needs go out of the world (1 Cor. v. 10). In order to clear up this difficult question, and others relating to marriage, to the behaviour of women in the assemblies, to the right use of spiritual gifts such as the gift of tongues and the gift of prophecy, it was thought well to send three deputies to

Ephesus, and these men—Stephanatus, Fortunatus, and Achaicus—were at this very time with St. Paul, and were awaiting the return of Timothy before starting again for Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 17, 18).

Lastly, the Apostle had received from another source information as to the state of the Church. A lady named Chloe, either a Christian from Ephesus who had been staying in Corinth, or a native of Corinth who had come to Ephesus, had brought Paul news of the Church. It was particularly through some of her household that Paul had heard of the party names which were so harmfully dividing the Church (1 Cor. i. 11).

Thus much we are able to ascertain of the events which had been transpiring at Corinth from the time of the Apostle's leaving the city to the writing of this first Epistle. Must we yet add to these circumstances, as many do, another visit of Paul himself to this Church? Reference is indeed made in several passages in the second Epistle to two visits made by Paul to Corinth, which would imply that Paul had visited the city a second time since the foundation of the Church. But we have already expressed our conviction that the first and second canonical Epistles are separated by a much longer interval than is generally supposed, and it is to this interval between the first and second letters that we assign the second visit. Else why does the Apostle make no allusion to it in his first letter, but refers exclusively to circumstances connected with the founding of the Church? We have now before us the general facts preceding the writing of this letter, and may go on to study it in detail.

F. GODET.

(To be concluded.)

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

II.

THE BOOK OF EXODUS.

EXODUS ii. 10. As a Hebrew word, *Mosheh* would have an active force, *drawing out*, not *drawn out*. It is generally considered by modern scholars to be the Egyptian *mes* or *messu*, signifying *son*, which frequently occurs on the monuments, sometimes as part of a compound (as *Taut-mes* *Τούθμωσις*, *Ta-messu*, etc.), sometimes as forming a proper name by itself. The name *means* "son" then, but the choice of it is explained in the text by its resemblance to the rare Hebrew word (Ps. xviii. 16 [17 Heb.]) signifying *to draw out*.¹

iii. 14. The text (in which *am* corresponds to *γίγνομαι* rather than *εἰμι*) expresses the truth that God's nature, while manifesting itself actively, cannot be defined in terms of any other substance, but can be measured only by itself (cf. the phrases in iv. 13; xxxiii. 19; 2 Kings viii. 1); hence it includes also the further truth that being not determined by anything external to Himself, He is consistent with Himself, and unchangeable. Of the alternatives in the margin, the first is substantially that of Aben Ezra (12th century), the name itself being strictly confined to the words *I am*, the clause following being its explanation. The second, *I am who am* (i.e. *I, who am, am*), expresses

¹ Ebers, *Durch Gosen zum Sinai* (ed. 1, 1872), p. 526; Dillmann, *Commentar über Ex.-Lev.* (1880), p. 16, who give further references.

nearly the same sense; the relative, when it implies a reason (xxx. 18; xlii. 21), being either translated literally, or resolvable into a conjunction. This interpretation is defended by Mr. Aldis Wright, in the *Journal of Philology*, 1872, p. 70-2. The third alternative is as old as Aquila and Theodotion (2nd century), ἔσομαι ὅς ἔσομαι, and its claims are urged by Prof. W. Robertson Smith in an article in the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, 1876, p. 153. The name in this case expresses a promise; *I will be* to my people *that I will be*—Jehovah will show Himself to be more than can be stated in words, or defined except in terms of Himself.

15. *Margin.* The form *Jehovah* first came into vogue in the 16th century; and though it is now too familiar to English-speaking people to be displaced, it possesses no claim to represent, even approximately, the ancient pronunciation of יהוה among the Hebrews. In all probability the actual pronunciation of the sacred name was *Yahweh* (יהוה); this agrees with the pronunciation as attested by Epiphanius, and (for the Samaritans) by Theodoret ('Ιαβε), explains the contracted form *-yāhu*, which was in general use in the second part of compound proper names (*Yēsha'yāhu*, *Yirmēyāhu*, etc.), and would be the form which a name derived from יהוה, *to be*, would, by analogy, assume (cf. עקב from עקב, etc.). The form of the substantive verb in common use in Hebrew is *hayah* (whence *ehyeh*, "I am," or "I will be," in v. 14), not *hawah* (whence *Yahweh* would be derived); *hawah* is the form used in Aramaic (including the Aramaic dialect of Daniel and Ezra, of the Targums, and Syriac), and Arabic,¹ and six times in Hebrew (Gen. xxvii. 29; Isa. xvi. 4; Job xxxvii. 6; Neh. vi. 6;

¹ In the sense of *falling* (Qor'an liii. 1, "By the star when it *setteth*!"), whence it comes to express the related ideas of *happening*, *coming to pass*, *coming to be*, γίγνεσθαι (which is the proper meaning of both יהוה and הוה). The primitive sense of the root is retained once in Hebrew, Job xxxvii. 6, "Who saith to the snow, *Fall earthwards*!"

Eccles. ii. 22; xi. 3). From the fact that יְהוָה is thus explained by means of the form in ordinary use, it may be inferred that the name itself originated at a period in the history of the ancestors of the Israelites when *hawah* had not yet been generally substituted for *hayah*.¹

vii. 9. The margin calls attention to the fact that the word used here, and v. 10, 12, is a different one from that in iv. 3. In fact, as is clear from many indications, the section vi. 1-vii. 13 is *parallel* to iii. 1-vi. 1, not a continuation of it, being an account from another source of the commission given to Moses, and the preliminary negotiations with Pharaoh.

13, 14. In this and the following chapters two different words are used to express the hardening of Pharaoh's heart. In the R.V. the distinction is preserved by rendering כָּבֵד *stubborn*, the literal sense of each being at the same time indicated in the margin. Like the last, this variation also is due to the composite structure of the narrative.

ix. 31. On the word *bolled*, inherited from the version of Coverdale (1535), and meaning "swollen, podded for seed,"² see the Preface. The Heb. נִבְעַל which occurs only here in O.T., is understood in this sense by LXX. (σπερματίζον), and the Peshitto;³ but the rendering of the margin, *was in blossom*, appears to be more probable. Gesenius pointed out that the Heb. נִבְעַל was used in post-

¹ So Gen. iii. 30, *Chawwah* is explained by the ordinary form *chay* ("living"). The verb *chawah* is known only from Phœnician; the other dialects have *chayah*.

Two of the best expositions of the name יְהוָה are those of Oehler, *Theology of the Old Testament*, § 39, and of Prof. W. R. Smith, in the paper referred to above. See also, for an account of more recent theories respecting its origin and meaning, an essay by the present writer in *Studia Biblica*, by members of the University of Oxford (1885), p. 1 ff.

² W. Aldis Wright, *Bible Word Book*, ed. 2 (1884), p. 87 f.: "In Jamieson's Scotch Dictionary, *Boll* is defined as 'the globule which contains the seed or flax.'"

³ See Payne Smith's *Thesaurus Syriacus*, col. 1803.

Biblical Hebrew in the sense of *blossom*, not of *seed-pod*; and it is the fact that in Egypt, when barley is in ear, and wheat still green (about February), flax is blossoming. See the statements of travellers, collected by Knobel, and transcribed (without acknowledgment) by Keil; and add the note in the *Journal of Philology*, 1883, p. 299 f.

xii. 9. *The inwards thereof*—as the same expression is rendered uniformly in Leviticus (i. 9, and often).

36. The two words rendered in A.V. here (and iii. 22; xi. 2), *borrow* and *lend*, mean properly *to ask* (frequent in this sense), and *to let ask* (to let a person ask successfully, *i.e.* to give him what he requires). It is true that the latter word acquires the meaning of *lend* in Syriac; it is used, for instance, in Luke xi. 8, to represent the Greek *χρῆσθαι*; but there is no necessity to suppose that it was used only with reference to a loan in Hebrew. It occurs besides in O.T. only in 1 Sam. i. 28, with reference to Samuel. The most recent commentators, Keil (1878), and Dillmann (1880), explain in the sense of the R.V.

xx. 6. *Unto thousands, of them that love me*, etc. The comma after *thousands* affords an important clue to the sense. *Of them* is not a mere genitive to *thousands* (which would give an imperfect antithesis to v. 5), but has the force of *belonging to*, just as in the corresponding clause of v. 5: the iniquity of those who hate God is visited, it is said, upon those connected with them until the fourth generation, in the case of those that love Him, mercy is shown, not to the fourth generation of their descendants only, but *to thousands*, connected with or related to them. Some commentators, having in view the paraphrase in Deut. vii. 9, consider that by *thousands* is meant the thousandth generation; but it is better probably to understand the expression more generally. The consequences of sin are declared to affect only a few generations of the sinner's own descendants; the benefits of a righteous life embrace thousands,

descendants or others, who come within reach of its influence.

xx. 13. *Do no murder for shalt not kill.* The word is always used of death inflicted with violence.

xxi. 6; xxii. 8, 9. *God for the judges.* The sentence of the judge being regarded, in primitive times, as a Divine oracle;¹ cf. xviii. 15 f., where those who consult Moses on matters of civil right ("between a man and his neighbour"), are said to *inquire of God*.

xxii. 20. See on Deut. vii. 2.

xxiv. 24. *Pillars.* See on xxxiv. 13.

xxv. 6. *Sealskins.* That the Hebrew *tachash* denotes either the seal, or some similar marine creature, is now generally allowed, on the evidence of the Arabic *tuchas*, which has the same sense. Perhaps the particular animal meant may be the dugong, which is abundant on the coasts of the Red Sea, where it reaches a considerable size. See the particulars collected by Knobel, in his *Commentary* (1857), and repeated in Dillmann; or Tristram's *Natural History of the Bible* (1868), p. 44 f. The meaning of the word was unknown to the translators of the ancient versions, in all of which it is taken as the name of a colour.

6. *Acacia.* This also (here and often) is admitted to be the meaning of the Hebrew *shittim*.

xxvi. 6, 7. See on xxvii. 21.

36, 37. *Screen for hanging.* Both the word, and what is denoted by it, are different from the "hangings" of xxvii. 11 ff.

xxvii. 21. *Tent of meeting for tabernacle of the congregation.* Two important changes. (1) *Tent for Tabernacle.* What is commonly known as the "Tabernacle" consisted of two parts, a מִשְׁכָּן, or "dwelling-place," formed by the boards and fine linen curtains set up in the manner described in chap. xxv. and xxvi. 1-6, and an אֹהֶל, or "tent,"

¹ Compare Sir Henry Maine's *Ancient Law*, ch. i.

properly so called, constructed of curtains of goat's hair thrown over the "dwelling-place," to contain and shelter it, and described in xxvi. 7-13. In A.V. some confusion is occasioned by the same word "Tabernacle" being used to represent both **משכן** and **אהל**: in the R.V. *Tabernacle* has been retained (with margin *dwelling-place*) as a conventional rendering for **משכן**; **אהל** is rendered throughout by the word which at once suggests what it denotes, viz. *Tent*. The purport of xxvi. 7-13, is now clear. The "tabernacle" having been completed, and its curtains fastened together (v. 6), there follows a description of the "tent" to be thrown over it, to close it in. V. 14 describes the outer covering of this tent, made of coarser materials, as a protection from the weather.

(2) *Meeting for the congregation.* **מועד** *mō'ēd* is derived from the verb **יעד** *yā'ad*, to appoint, in the reflexive conjugation, to let oneself be appointed, hence to meet by appointment, or at least to meet by mutual consent. **מועד** now, may signify either the act, or the place, or the time of appointment, or meeting: Job, for instance, calls the underworld ("Sheol") **בית מועד לכל חי**, the house (or place) of meeting for all living (xxx. 23). By analogy **אהל מועד** will signify the tent of meeting, i.e. either the tent at which the people assembled at stated times for worship, or, as is much more probable, from a comparison of the passages referred to on the margin (add Num. xvii. 4), the tent where Jehovah meets Moses or the people, and reveals Himself to them. The latter is the view generally accepted by modern scholars. The LXX. and Vulg. derived **מועד** incorrectly from **העיד עיד**, to bear witness, rendering *σκαηνή τοῦ μαρτυρίου* and *tabernaculum testimonii* (or *fæderis*). The rendering of A.V. (adopted from the Geneva version of 1560¹), obliterates the distinctive character of the Hebrew expression.

¹ Coverdale (1535) has "the Tabernacle of witness."

xxix. 22. *Fat tail*. So Lev. iii. 9 and often. The corresponding word in Arabic has the same meaning. The allusion is to the large tail of particular breeds of sheep, often noticed by travellers in the East (first by Herodotus, iii. 113), and esteemed a delicacy.¹

xxxii. 25. *Broken loose*; see v. 4; 2 Chron. xxviii. 19, where the same root occurs.

xxxiii. 7-11. *Now Moses used*, etc. The tenses used here and throughout this paragraph in the original show that it is no continuation of the preceding narrative (as might be inferred from the rendering of the A.V.), but that it describes the habitual practice of Moses and the people with reference to the tent of meeting. The tenses used are the imperfect (for *used to take*) followed by perfects with the so-called "*waw conversive*," and these, whether used alone or together, uniformly express an habitual custom or practice; see, for instance, chap. xxxiv. 34-5; Gen. xxix. 2-3 (where in the Hebrew it appears plainly that the narrative in ver. 2, *and he looked*, is continued by *and Jacob said*, in ver. 4, the intermediate words (*for out of to in its place*) being an explanatory parenthesis, describing the habit of the shepherds); xxx. 41-2; Jud. ii. 18, 19; 1 Sam. i. 4-7; xvi. 23; 2 Sam. xv. 5; xvii. 17 (R.V.); 2 Kings xii. 15-17; etc.

xxxiv. 13; *pillars for images*. מִצְבֵּה means properly *something set up*, and is sometimes rightly rendered *pillar* in the A.V.: e.g. Gen. xxviii. 18; xxxi. 13, 45. More commonly in the O.T. it is used of the pillars or obelisks which were erected in, or in front of, heathen temples, especially those of Baal (2 Kings x. 26 f.), and which, as the symbols of a false worship, the Israelites are consistently commanded to destroy. At one time, such consecrated pillars appear to have been permitted in the worship of Jehovah; but this also is prohibited in Deut. xvi. 22. The word does not mean *an image*; it occurs often in Phœnician inscriptions;

¹ Cf. Tristram, *l.c.* p. 143 f.

and an obelisk found at Larnaca in 1880, about $4\frac{1}{2}$ feet in height, is actually described as "this *mazzébeth*." ¹

13. *Ashêrim* for *groves*. This change is mentioned in the Preface. The rendering *grove*, although as old as the LXX., is shown by a review of the passages in which the word occurs, to be incorrect. Some of the terms used with reference to the *Ashêra* would, it is true, be applicable to a grove (*e.g.* to *plant*), but not others (*e.g.* to *make*, *set up*, *break*). The *Ashêra* was clearly a wooden object (see Deut. xvi. 21, and compare the terms *hew*, *cut down*, *burn*, applied to it), and is generally considered to have been the rudely-shaped stem of a tree, deprived of its boughs, and planted in the ground, which was venerated by the native Canaanites as a religious symbol. *Ashêras* are alluded to in the O.T., often in connexion with the worship of Baal (*e.g.* Jud. vi. 25 f.), sometimes, also, as introduced into the worship of Jehovah (2 Kings xxiii. 6 f.); one erected by Ahab in Samaria (1 Kings xvi. 33), is mentioned long afterwards (2 Kings xiii. 6). The meaning of the name is uncertain; it may, perhaps, be connected with אֲשֶׁר *happiness*, and denote the goddess of fortune. It must not be hastily identified with 'Ashtôreth (plural 'Ashtârôth); the words in Hebrew are very different; and while the name of 'Ashtôreth occurs frequently on Phœnician inscriptions as the name of the consort of Baal,² the name *Ashêra* has not, with certainty,³ been so found hitherto.

xxxiv. 33. *And when Moses* for *And till Moses*. *Till* cannot be justified, and implies a misunderstanding of the narrative. The people overcame (v. 31-2) their reluctance to

¹ See the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* (Paris, 1881), i. No. 44, with the representation in the volume of plates. (Also in the *Z.D.M.G.*, 1880, p. 676).

² *E.g.* the inscription of Eshmunezer, king of Sidon (4th cent. B.C.), line 15: "priestess of 'Ashtôreth, our lady;" lines 17-18, "we who have built temples to the gods of the Sidonians, in Sidon, the country of the sea; a temple for Baal of Sidon, and a temple for 'Ashtôreth . . ."

³ Comp. Schroeder in the *Z.D.M.G.*, 1881, p. 424-5, with the criticism in Stade's *Zeitschrift für alttest. Wissenschaft*, 1881, p. 314 f.

approach Moses, and he put the veil on his face only when he had finished his formal address, and resumed his ordinary every-day relation towards them. The Hebrew is literally, *And Moses finished speaking with them, and put*, etc., which in our idiom (which prefers to treat the temporal clause as subordinate to the principal statement in the sentence¹) becomes, *And when Moses finished speaking with them, he put*, etc. *By reason of* for *while*, in v. 29, is another alteration which helps to make the narrative plainer.

xxxv.-xxxix. These chapters are principally a description of the execution, nearly in the same words (the tenses, of course, being changed) of the instructions given in chaps. xxv.-xxxi.

xxxvi. 1. The verse is the end of Moses' speech, xxxv. 30-35.

xxxix. 33 ff.; xl. 17 ff. After the distinction explained above between the "tabernacle" and the "tent," these notices will be understood without difficulty by the reader.

S. R. DRIVER.

ISAAC TAYLOR.

THE late Dante Gabriel Rossetti saw one day upon a book-stall some small engraved illustrations of the Bible; struck with their originality, he took them home, and showing them to a friend, said, "See, what fine things; who is this Isaac Taylor?" a question which his friend, a man of thought and reading, was able to answer. Afterwards, in a notice of Blake, Rossetti wrote of them as "seldom equalled for imaginative impression," and as in simplicity, dignity,

¹ So constantly: Exod. xvi. 21, "and the sun waxed hot, and it melted"—"and when the sun, etc., it melted;" Gen. xlv. 27, etc.

and original thought, bearing a close affinity to the mass of Blake's works.

Of these illustrations, commissioned by Boydell, who had recently published the Shakespeare Gallery, and engraved by the designer's father, Isaac Taylor, of Ongar, those belonging to the Old Testament are what attracted Rossetti's attention; they are far the best, but throughout, the drawings, delicately finished in Indian ink, are much superior to the engravings. One of the most striking represents the two parents of the race wandering forth hand-in-hand into the dark wilderness, a faint blaze athwart the sky as of a shaft of ethereal fire, indicating the sword of wrath. In the deluge, the flare of a huge comet, the supposed cause of the catastrophe, illuminates the waste of waters, in the midst of which the ark, a solitary speck, floats without sign of life. To Abraham, the three angels clothed in white appear as if, having ascended from the distant plain, they had suddenly stepped into sight on the edge of the hill. In the Egyptian subjects, Pharaoh on his throne is surrounded by the colossal forms of sphinx and column; and in the desert scenes, the innumerable host, and the lonely dignity of the great leader, are finely contrasted. In all these the realism, and at the same time the grandeur of conception, are conspicuous, but are perhaps nowhere better shown than where the headless body of Saul hangs suspended on the wall of Bethshan, vultures careering round it whose flapping wings catch light from a low moon breaking through heavy clouds. Two of the designs he enlarged into coloured drawings: the finding of the body of Samson among the ruins; and the troops of Darius entering Babylon along the dry bed of the river on that night when Belshazzar was slain. This last however was not engraved.

Haydon had fallen in with another series of Isaac Taylor's designs, and, like Rossetti, had been greatly struck with them. These were slight things illustrating his

father's *Early Ages*, a book for young people. Among them, "Alaric entering Rome" particularly impressed the painter. The barbaric car of the conqueror is seen crossing a bridge over the Tiber amidst a conflagration that casts a lurid light upon the mighty mausoleum of Hadrian, towering in the distance. Besides the imaginative power displayed in these designs—Biblical and other—the historic insight is remarkable. There is no conventionalism, but a genuine attempt, by truth of costume and of surrounding landscape, to represent the scene as it really was, yet from a point of view that revealed its innate grandeur of suggestion. One might regret that Isaac Taylor's pencil found no larger scope, had not the same imaginative insight presently inspired his pen.

That his thoughts should at one time have found expression in art was no doubt due to the fact that both his father and grandfather were artists—eminent engravers of their day. His grandfather, who was also an art-publisher, designed book illustrations as well as engraved them; of his father's engravings after Stothard, Opie, and others, some were of large size and admirable quality, and he had also a considerable art ability of his own, excelling in landscape and in miniature painting. All his children, daughters as well as sons, were employed in the engraving room, and the young Isaac among them; no separate work however appears to have been engraved by him. He early took to drawing in water colour or Indian ink, small subjects but highly finished, and at one time began the practice of portrait painting in miniature, as a profession. To the last the influence of his art training and taste were manifest; before the days of pre-Raphaelitism his original and independent mind had led him to propound very similar theories. He especially enjoyed pure light and colour. One of his latest essays had for its subject "The Ornamentation of Nature;" but characteristically it led up to the consideration of form

and colour as expressions of the Divine mind, indications of an hitherto unnamed attribute. The spectacle of nature was to him a subject of endless meditation.

To such a mind, equally contemplative as imaginative, the means of expression afforded to the artist soon became insufficient. His sisters Ann and Jane had shown that with the pen they could do better than with the burin, and he was not long in finding his true vocation as a writer.

George Eliot wrote of Isaac Taylor as "one of the most eloquent, acute, and pious of writers," and though in after years she regarded him as one who had fallen behind the age, she had then resigned her belief in Christianity, and it may well be asked whither had those advanced whom she had come to look upon as the new leaders of thought? Judging from the mournful cries that reach us, it is a barren wilderness in which they find themselves, enveloped in a darkness which may be felt—that which to some is a horror of great darkness. Listen to Carlyle, surrounded by his dim infinitudes and fathomless abysses, clinging as in death grip to the one awful Being in whom he still strove to believe, yet to whom he dared not utter one word of prayer, and of whom he once exclaimed with a bitter cry, "He is a God who does nothing"! Listen to George Eliot's sterner, sadder, more hopeless declaration, that of the three great powers that had hitherto ruled human thought—"God, Immortality, Duty"—there remained only the last! Shall these voices of the night tempt us to follow where one by one they die away and are lost? Surely Isaac Taylor did well to remain within the bounds of that heaven-illuminated region—the Gospel Revelation; no narrow space, and opening like everything Divine, interminable avenues on every side for thought and speculation.

He may indeed be called the evangelic thinker of his time. The oracular transcendentalisms of Coleridge, by which he sought to re-inaugurate the Christian Church, do

not fairly entitle him to that position. The earnest special pleadings of Maurice, sarcastically described by Carlyle as attempts to prove that "black is white and that white is all the whiter because it is black," do not justify such a claim. The gentle musings of Erskine of Linlathen, who, according to the same caustic authority, was almost inclined to admit that the Christian story might be a myth, so that the spirit of Christianity were retained, do not qualify him for such an office. Isaac Taylor, unlike these, having founded his belief upon the historic truth of the events recorded in the Gospels, which he held to be irrefragable, and upon the Apostolic teaching, which he accepted as of absolute authority, devoted himself in the first place to the analysis and the history of those morbid emotions which had perverted Christianity, and then to the elucidation of the Divine economy in its threefold grandeur—as disclosed in the material universe, in the capacities of the human soul, and in those "insulated revelations of things necessary to be known by mankind," which the Scriptures hold forth. Thus he occupied at once a more definite and a wider field than any of his contemporaries—more definite, as it was concerned with facts, material, historical, revealed; and wider, as it embraced the whole of the Divine order of things, visible and invisible, so far as it can be known to us. The range of thought was indeed vast; portions only of the great subject could be dealt with, but these did not fail in breadth and elevation of treatment.

It was this wide range again that separated him from Chalmers, Robert Hall, and Foster. The first two were essentially preachers, treating of the common salvation, the one with fervent iteration of its chief doctrines, the other with pure and elevated diction. They did not seek to explore new regions under the guidance of evangelic thought. With Foster's style of mind, his originality, power, force of expression, and searching analysis of human motive, there

was much similarity. But here again, with regard to extent and variety of thought, there can be no comparison.

We have seen that historical insight was a leading characteristic of Isaac Taylor's genius in design; that insight is conspicuous in all his literary work, which, in the first instance, was almost entirely historical. An early volume entitled *Elements of Thought*, was due probably to the educational bias of his family; a second, the *Characters of Theophrastus*, translated and illustrated by careful drawings on wood by himself, showed alike his interest in mental analysis, and in the pictorial expression of his ideas; but the *History of the Transmission of Ancient Books to Modern Times*, the *Process of Historical Proof*, the *Translation of Herodotus*, were the first serious labours of his pen; while an anonymous romance, the *Temple of Melekartha*, published in the same year with the *Natural History of Enthusiasm*, the book (to quote Sir James Stephen) from which he derived his "literary peerage," exhibits, especially in its earlier chapters, all that realization of history which the practice of historical design had taught him.

Though *Melekartha* failed as a story, as it was sure to fail, encumbered as it is with philosophical disquisition and lengthy speeches, it is well worth perusal, not only for several powerful scenes, but for the early expression it contains of most of the author's leading ideas. It opens with a vivid description of a Phœnician galley, "deeply laden with jars of Grecian wine for the market of Memphis." The Sidonian master, the Greek seamen, the Egyptian merchants, the "complement of slaves in the lowest part of the hold, huddled together like eels in the basket of a vendor of fish," are depicted with the fidelity of actual vision. Then follows a brilliant picture of a Greek trireme, glaring in scarlet, its golden carvings glittering in the sun, its "bright lines of blue and yellow running from prow to poop," its "three

beaks of brass now dipping, now weltering from the wave,' which suddenly "stared upon the sight against the deep azure of the sky, and gained a grace and lightness from the snowy foam caused by the sudden backstroke of two hundred oars."

In such pictures, and they are many, we have the feeling of the artist inspiring the learning of the scholar. The supposed narrator, a learned Greek, describes his landing at Old Tyre, then subject to the "Great King." He tells of the innumerable lanes and alleys, the blind walls and lofty balconies, the sacred animals, "bloated divinities," that wander through the streets, "or lie coiled and basking dusty scales in the sun;" he watches the travellers—Armenians, Caucasians, or long visaged Indians—that pour ceaselessly through the gates, or the occasional passage of a Persian satrap's train, the great man borne in a close litter, his guards attired, to the contempt of the Greeks, in the "sublime of military millinery." Insular, or New Tyre, with its magnificent colonnade encircling the harbour, furnishes equal material for precise description; but the chief object of the Greek traveller is to visit the venerable Temple of Melekartha, in the midst of its sacred grove, at some distance from the old city. There he associates with the priests, witnesses the mysteries, and finally obtains leave to study the ancient records preserved in the "House of History."

These relate to the original settlement of the Phœnician people on the island of Ormus in the Persian Gulf, under a wise ruler, the hero of the race, to the development of their commerce in the Eastern seas, and to the eventual migration of the people to the Mediterranean coast under stress of a vast Asiatic invasion. This is the story; but the chief purport of it is to depict the rise of superstition, and of a priestly order devoted to the blood-stained worship of Molech, which gradually saps the strength and depraves

the intellect of the nation. The period supposed is of high antiquity, where historical details fail, and the writer is therefore at liberty to present something of an ideal picture. Yet the historical instinct still finds place, as in descriptions of Nineveh (written however before the Layard discoveries), of Babylon, the wreck of the "Tower of Pride," or of the march of the great destroyer, with his innumerable hordes, from the Asian steppes.

This story of the baneful rise of superstition no doubt assumes the possession by mankind of an original inheritance of truth; reference is made to traditions of a great catastrophe, and to the dispersion of mankind from the Babylonian plains; but the Biblical account is not directly made use of, out of place as it would have been in Phœnician records. The work seems to have been the joint result of the study of Herodotus, recently translated, and of the train of thought which was producing the *Natural History of Enthusiasm*, and which issued later in *Fanaticism*, and *Spiritual Despotism*, that series of works illustrating the principal forms of spurious or corrupted religion, of which, as he has stated, he had many years before contemplated a comprehensive view. Earlier still the subject seems to have occupied his mind, if the anecdote be true, that when all but a boy, his mother observing him leaning his head in a pensive way against the mantelpiece, asked about what he was thinking, when he replied, "I am thinking of the evils that have come upon Christianity."

The *Natural History of Enthusiasm* had an extraordinary success; but a book of a different order, the meditations entitled *Saturday Evening*, attracted perhaps no less attention. After dwelling upon the perversions and abuses of Christianity, Isaac Taylor's mind seems to have sought rest and refreshment in turning from those "things which are seen and temporal," with all their imperfections and accumulated evils, to contemplate those which are "un-

seen and eternal." Of these, unseen as they might be, he was convinced that the Apostolic writers afforded authentic intimations, glimpses into the spiritual world which would amply reward the fixed and inquiring gaze of a devout and philosophic mind, and reveal ever more of the majesty, beauty, unity of the Divine order, of which the destinies of man form a part.

The firm confidence he felt in Apostolic testimony was only enhanced by his prolonged study of the heated fancies, illusions, malignant and corrupt imaginations, that filled the brains of enthusiasts, fanatics, and arrogant pretenders to invisible power. To such, the calm "good sense" of Apostles and Evangelists, a quality he often insisted upon, presented a striking contrast. "Exaggeration and inflation have their own style, it is not difficult to recognise it," he says; and having had abundant opportunity for judging of that style, he finds none in the writings of those who tell of "all that Jesus began to do and to teach until the day in which He was taken up," nor in the revelations that afterwards were "received of the Lord." But, consistently with the historical bias of his mind, it was the belief of facts, not an "opinion of the truth of principles" upon which he laid stress. Upon facts all his speculations rested; these betrayed no trace of mysticism, while equally free from a dogmatic or systematizing tendency, to which he had a strong aversion. "The dogmatist," he says, "puts in movement the irresistible engine of his logical apparatus, and nothing can withstand the stress and power of this machinery. In fact, absolutely nothing retains its native form after it has passed under the tooth and lever of metaphysical compression. Forth comes orthodox divinity; not indeed the sublime and mysterious divinity of the Scriptures, but that of the chair."

Yet he must not be mistaken. Distributing the study of Holy Scripture under three heads—"the devout or practical,

the critical or verbal, and the scientific or theological"—he says: "If the third be at a low ebb, there is no intelligence, no advancement, and therefore, by necessity, a retrogression and decay in that kind of knowledge which should furnish guidance and motive both to devout and critical studies."

It was natural temperament, therefore—a temperament which found in tranquil meditation its congenial element—that had most to do with his avoidance of theological discussion. His attitude towards a now much debated question is characteristic. "To what extent the Sacrifice once offered for the sins of mankind has actually taken effect, we neither know, nor have the means of surmising. The world of spirits is veiled; the inspired writers are silent; and on such a theme theological rigidity, together with bold conjecture, should be checked. Meantime it is certain—as certain as the Gospel—that the mercy of God has had no other channel, and that to each of us severally there is hope in Christ, and no other hope." The Essay which opens with this statement is entitled the *Means of Mercy*, but it is occupied with no theological exposition. Taking the fact of sin, "this companion of our existence," it dwells upon "the sense we have of the fitness of retribution" as it "flashes upon us in some form every hour;" upon "the record" of sin, which on each individual "table of memory, like the face of an obelisk thickly inscribed, and fronting the sun, may one day be read by all!" and advances thus, in a final paragraph, to the Pardon of the Gospel, as "A PARDON FOR A REASON."

Of these *Saturday Evening* meditations, marked by a philosophic breadth, dignity, and richness of diction new to evangelic thought, George Eliot's admiration is recorded; and though with the singular, and as it seems, sudden loss of Christian belief that befell her—so sudden as to indicate a radical infirmity of mind—the groundwork of that admiration was, no doubt, in the end swept away, minds that

enjoyed a more deeply founded belief in Christianity, and capable of appreciating Isaac Taylor's largeness of view, felt that they were lifted into a serene and noble region of thought, where yet there was solid footing.

For there is nothing vague, transcendental, or of the nature of rhapsody in these speculations; many are directly practical; in others, if there is imagination, it is imagination roused, as in his historical designs, by the grandeur of the facts before him, and exercised strictly within the limits of those facts. It is interesting, too, to note how the style, not only of this, but of all his writings, indicates an imagination accustomed to pictorial expression. It is not luxuriantly picturesque, but full of imagery in which the conception proper to the artist is apparent. We may gather a few examples. He is speaking of the mind as passive in dreams—"while through the hushed palace of fancy a vast or threatening pageant moves on." He describes those who, "by the ladder of reason have gone up to behold the Most High,—the Spirit of Grace takes us by another path." He speaks of "the sons of immortality that awake to their lot in the future world," and "the child of heaven breathes at length his proper element, looks without amazement over the endless road that lies outstretched at his feet." Or again, "Let it be supposed that a rational spirit, . . . after just tasting the fruits of heaven, and drinking of the cup of immortality, should find itself fast floating on to the brink of extinction! . . . should look down and see the abyss of death!" These, all within the compass of a few pages, illustrate this quality of his style—pictorial, ornate, but stately.

The solid footing of fact, from which he never strayed, whatever might be the nature of his speculations, is very apparent in, perhaps, the most original of his works, the *Physical Theory of Another Life*. When he turned his contemplations towards that great future, it was a "*physical theory*" which he constructed respecting it. "If," he

says, "the human family is to live anew, the future stage of its existence offers itself to our curiosity as a proper branch of the physiology of the species." He approaches the problem, therefore, on that side; but then, throughout his enquiry, he keeps "an ear open to the Apostolic voice," and especially takes as the text for his dissertation the assertion of St. Paul, "there is a spiritual body."

But if a "body," what are the necessary conditions of a corporeity endowed with higher powers? This enquiry occupies the larger part of the book, several chapters towards the end being devoted to "conjectures concerning the correlative construction and reciprocal destinies of the material and spiritual universe."

Here we may note another side of Isaac Taylor's mind. He was as much interested in the facts of science as in any other, and kept himself accurately informed of the progress and results of scientific research. The greatness and wonder of the facts disclosed by science inspired, and at the same time strictly controlled, his imagination, which found no interest in cloudland of any kind; while the quickness of his mental insight enabled him often to anticipate or forecast an eventual line of discovery. The different conjectures concerning the nature and destiny of the visible universe show a thorough acquaintance with what, up to the date of writing, was the teaching of science respecting it, and are thereby however startling, saved from all vagueness or incongruity. That "the visible and palpable world . . . is *motion*, constant and uniform, emanating from infinite centres," is one of those ultimate conclusions of science upon which he founded a conjecture which is at once widest in scope and the most strikingly supported by the language of Scripture. "If," as he argues, "motion in all cases originates from mind, or in other words, is the effect of will—either the Supreme Will, or the will of created minds," then "the instantaneous cessation of this energy, or its reaching its

close, is abstractedly quite as easily conceived of as its continuance." "Then the annihilation of the solid spheres, the planets, the suns, . . . would not be an act of irresistible force crushing that which resists compression—it would not be a destruction, but a rest; not a crash, but a pause;" and "all the host of heaven would be dissolved"—"the heavens vanish away like smoke!"

He never feared the result of purely scientific investigation, but he repudiated the interference of one path of enquiry with that of another essentially different. In *The Temple of Melekartha*, a sage, in an ideal city of learning, insists strongly upon the perfect independence allowed to each line of investigation, "resting," he says, "upon the thorough conviction entertained by our society of the imperfection and feebleness of the human mind as compared with the *infinitude* and the *secrecy* of nature." "Those," he continues, "are deemed alike unworthy members of our community who, on the one hand, hesitate on the path of investigation, in apprehension of the supposed dangerous consequences of the principles they are pursuing; or who, on the other, eagerly pursue certain principles in the hope of acquiring the means of demolishing the convictions of other men—founded on other evidence. The one sort are too superstitious, the other too opinionated and malignant, to be successful labourers on the field of science; and we discard both."

We may make one more quotation here in illustration of the influence of that art-feeling upon which we have laid stress. "Finally, the observer of nature should be keenly alive to that sentiment—an instinct not to be defined or described—which fills the soul with delight in the presence of material beauty;—beauty in its large sense, the infinite combinations of uniformity and difference." Science is not apt to take cognizance of this department.

If in dealing with the problems of a Future Life, Isaac Taylor started with a *Physical Theory*, he no less did so in considering the phenomena of mind. Yet not in a materialistic sense. On the contrary, he asserts that "we shall have made an acquisition worth the labour it has cost us when we have brought ourselves to acquiesce—fully and freely—in the belief that MIND and MATTER are both of them real existences; not one the product of the other, but each absolute in its own manner." What he meant by a "Physical Mental Philosophy," as he calls it, is thus explained in the early work just quoted:—

"Learn to discard the delusive distinction between Instinct and Reason, or at least learn to seek a better distinction between man and the inferior tribes. . . . Whatever possesses the power of voluntary locomotion and in virtue of its possession of that power is entrusted with the care of its own life, reasons." And among the arrangements of the "City of Sages," there is this: "We are especially careful to preserve the important distinction between the proper physical science of human nature, and those abstractions metaphysical, which have often and injuriously been mingled with it." "Our science of mind rests upon the broadest possible basis. . . . We begin this difficult study, not in its most finished and elaborate, but in its simplest combinations. We work upwards—we learn mind more in the way of observation than of analysis; and before we presume to speak of the intellectual conformation of man, carefully study that of the oyster and the earth-worm."

This conception of the subject reappears in his *Physical Theory of Another Life*, and is pursued at large in one of his latest works, *The World of Mind*, in which a striking chapter, entitled "The Breadth of the World of Mind," sets forth the vastness of this field of contemplation as it regards animal life alone: "a scheme of existence the length

and breadth, the height and depth of which surpass all powers of thought, but throughout which good prevails; upon which evil makes no inroad; and upon which organic pain glances only for an instant." But there is "a point of divergence of the higher and lower forms of mind." The higher soon declares itself; first, in a consciousness of personal identity, as "impressions, images, ideas are tending to fall into chronological order." "Man is not man until the moment when he learns to look upon himself from the historical point of view." But this divergence appears more decidedly as the human mind arrives at a consciousness of freedom—freedom of volition and act—"a freedom apart from which there could neither be intellectual expansion nor moral progress." "Human nature and the brute nature *diverge at this point*, and henceforth are separated by an ever widening interval." The enquiry is pursued through the various faculties and relations of mind, in this the highest form known to us, till it touches its relations to the unknown and the infinite.

Here we meet with an instructive instance of his use of science. "Science," he says, "which within a fifty years has made an outburst upon the fields of infinite space and infinite time." It is astronomy, the revelations of the microscope, and geology which have done this. Of the latter he says, it "begins its boundless course in a garden or a gravel-pit, or by the roadside; . . . and it goes on, . . . treading forward in the midst of things that are visible and palpable—stedfast in its adherence to the surest principles of inferential reasoning; it goes on until it has made good a standing at a point so remote from the present moment that the mind averts itself from the thought of the awful intervening lapse of cycles of ages." Thus he comes to the proposition that, "The Infinite, although it is not to be comprehended by the human reason, may be infallibly apprehended by it, or may be brought within

its cognisable range, and may be known as *unquestionable* though it is not known as to its constituents or its conditions."

So far science, but "the only form of truth moral and spiritual concerning the unknown and the infinite which in this age we need be concerned with . . . has come to us in the categoric or peremptory form of an attested utterance from the unseen world. Thus reaching us, this body of religious truth takes its position alongside of our modern physical science in this way: The two revelations, the physical and the religious, both of them lead on toward the infinite and the unknown, and both alike take their departure from that which is intelligible, and definite, and certain."

With these words, the key to all his thinking, we might fitly close our remarks upon the mental attitude of Isaac Taylor. We have not indeed even mentioned several of his works, bearing testimony to the wonderful activity and range of his intellect, but which do not carry further the illustration of its leading characteristics. *Ancient Christianity*, for instance, while it exhibits the wealth and soundness of his patristic lore, is controversial; so also in a manner is the *Restoration of Belief*. To both he was urged by a sense of the supreme importance of the points assailed, in the one case, the purity of Apostolic Christianity, in the other Christianity itself. His usual habit was to hold in suspense controverted matters, and this not only from personal distaste, but from a desire not to encumber certainties with uncertainties. "Nothing can be more unwise" (we find him saying) "than to entangle the firm principles either of morals, or of religious belief, with films of conjecture." And again, "many questions, deep, perplexing, interminable, and unproductive also, start up and would disturb our meditations," and are therefore dismissed. Some of more vital import he foresaw as coming forward,

for determination. Among them was the question of Inspiration, the settlement of which he said "will involve changes." Upon the mode of understanding the early chapters of Genesis he was content to await light. Upon the "wider hope" he was silent, though not without glances into the great future. His natural sphere was meditation, lofty and tranquil. Once, when told of the grand solitude of Cape Wrath, he exclaimed, "Say no more, or I must pack up and go." "But what would you do there?" "Do! why meditate, meditate, meditate!" As it was, he was content with the woods and field-paths round Stanford Rivers.

We have endeavoured to give some slight idea of the original character and large scope of Isaac Taylor's thinking; to trace the evidences of a powerful historic imagination, first displayed in pictorial design, but finding its proper sphere in separating the real from the spurious and corrupt in the history of Christianity; to show that his most far-reaching speculations always took their departure from that which was "intelligible, definite, certain;" that however daring they might be with respect to things unseen, they were supported always by Revelation on the one side, and by the facts of science or of human nature on the other—that they were the speculations of a strictly scientific imagination.

It would, we think, be difficult to point out in modern religious literature a more extensive or more varied mass of thought than in Isaac Taylor's writings, nor any that, setting forth the grandeur of the Divine economy as a whole, better fulfil his desire of "confirming the faith and corroborating the religious sentiments of those who still adhere to the *Christianity of the Scriptures*."

If it be asked how did one to whom "things not seen as yet" were a subject of profound contemplation, comport himself when the gates of the unseen world were opening

before him? let two brief dying words suffice for answer. "I would be content," he said, "to reach the humblest place in the outermost circle of heavenly blessedness." And within a day or two of the end, after settling a small matter of business, he added, "I desire now to have nothing before me but an unclouded view of immortality."

JOSIAH GILBERT.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

VIII.

JOY IN SUFFERING, AND TRIUMPH IN THE MANIFESTED MYSTERY.

"Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and fill up on my part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body's sake, which is the Church; whereof I was made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which was given me to you-ward, to fulfil the word of God, even the mystery which hath been hid from all ages and generations: but now hath it been manifested to His saints, to whom God was pleased to make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory."—COL. i. 24-27 (Rev. Ver.).

THERE are scarcely any personal references in this Epistle, until we reach the last chapter. In this respect it contrasts strikingly with another of Paul's epistles of the captivity, that to the Philippians, which is running over with affection and with allusions to himself. This sparseness of personal details strongly confirms the opinion that he had not been to Colossæ. We come however here to one of the very few sections which may be called personal, though even here it is rather Paul's office than himself which is in question. He is led to speak of himself by his desire to enforce his exhortations to faithful continuance in the Gospel; and, as is so often the case with him in touching on his apostleship, he, as it were, catches fire,

and blazes up in a grand flame, which sheds a bright light on his lofty enthusiasm and evangelistic fervour.

The words taken for our consideration now are plain enough in themselves, but they are run together, and thought follows thought in a fashion which makes them somewhat obscure; and there are also one or two difficulties in single words which require to be cleared up. We shall perhaps best bring out the course of thought by dealing with these verses in three groups, of which the three words, Suffering, Service, and Mystery are respectively the centres. First, we have a remarkable view taken by the prisoner of the meaning of his sufferings as for the Church. That leads him to speak of his relation to the Church generally as being that of a servant or steward appointed by God, to bring to its completion the work of God; and then, as I said, he takes fire, and, forgetting himself, flames up in rapturous magnifying of the grand message hid so long, and now entrusted to him to preach. So we have his Sufferings for the Church, his service of Stewardship to the Church, and the great Mystery which in that stewardship he had to unveil. It may help us to understand both Paul and his message, as well as our own tasks and trials, if we try to grasp his thoughts here about his work and his sorrows.

I. We have the Apostle's triumphant contemplation of his sufferings. "I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and fill up on my part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body's sake, which is the Church."

The Revised Version, following the best authorities, omits the "who" with which the Authorized Version begins this verse, and marks a new sentence and paragraph, as is obviously right.

The very first word is significant: "*Now* I rejoice." Ay; it is easy to say fine things about patience in sufferings

and triumph in sorrow when we are prosperous and comfortable; but it is different when we are in the furnace. This man, with the chain on his wrist, and the iron entering into his soul, with his life in danger, and all the future uncertain, can say, "*Now I rejoice.*" This bird sings in a darkened cage.

Then come startling words, "I on my part fill up that which is lacking (a better word than 'behind') of the afflictions of Christ." It is not surprising that many explanations of these words have tried to soften down their boldness; as, for instance, "afflictions borne for Christ," or "imposed by Him," or "like His." But it seems very clear that the startling meaning is the plain meaning, and that "the sufferings of Christ" here, as everywhere else, are "sufferings borne by Christ."

Then at once the questions start up, Does Paul mean to say that in any sense whatever the sufferings which Christ endured have anything "lacking" in them? or does he mean to say that a Christian man's sufferings, however they may benefit the Church, can be put alongside of the Lord's, and taken to eke out the incompleteness of His? Surely that cannot be! Did He not say on the cross, It is finished? Surely, that sacrifice needs no supplement, and can receive none, but stands "the one sacrifice for sins for ever"! Surely, His sufferings are absolutely singular in nature and effect, unique and all-sufficient and eternal. And does this Apostle, the very heart of whose Gospel was that these were the life of the world, mean to say that anything which he endures can be tacked on to them, a bit of the old rags to the new garment?

Distinctly not! It would be contradictory of the whole spirit and letter of the Apostle's teaching. But there is no need to suppose that he means anything of the sort. There is an idea frequently presented in Scripture, which

gives full meaning to the words, and is in full accordance with Pauline teaching; namely, that of Christ's true participation in the sufferings of His people borne for Him. He suffers with them. The head feels the pangs of all the members, and every ache and pain may be thought of as belonging, not only to the limb where it is located, but to the brain which is conscious of it. The pains and sorrows and troubles of his friends and followers to the end of time are one great whole; each sorrow of each Christian heart is one drop more added to the contents of the measure which has to be filled to the brim, ere the purposes of the Father who leads through suffering to rest are accomplished, and all belongs to Him. Whatsoever pain or trial is borne in communion with Him is felt and borne by Him. Community of sensation is established between Him and us. Our sorrows are transferred to Him. In all our afflictions He is afflicted, both by His mystical but most real oneness with us, and by His brother's sympathy.

So for us all, and not for the Apostle only, the whole aspect of our sorrows may be changed, and all poor struggling souls in this valley of weeping may take comfort and courage from the wonderful thought of Christ's union with us, which makes my griefs His, and my pain touch Him. Bruise your finger, and the pain pricks and stabs in your brain. Strike the man that is joined to Christ here, and Christ up yonder feels it. "He that toucheth you toucheth the apple of His eye." Where did Paul learn this deep lesson, that the sufferings of Christ's servants were Christ's sufferings? I wonder whether, as he wrote these words of confident yet humble identification of himself the persecuted with Christ the Lord, there came back to his memory what he heard that fateful day on the road to Damascus, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?" The thought so crushing to the persecutor

had become balm and glory to the prisoner, that every blow aimed at the servant falls on the Master, who stoops from amid the glory of the throne to declare that whatsoever is done, whether it be kindness or cruelty, to the least of His brethren, is done to Him. So every one of us may take the comfort and strength of that wonderful thought, and roll all our burdens and sorrows on Him.

Again, there is prominent here the thought that the good of sorrow does not end with the sufferer. His sufferings are borne in his *flesh*, for the *body's* sake, which is the Church,—a remarkable antithesis between the Apostle's flesh in which, and Christ's body for which, the sufferings are endured. Every sorrow rightly borne, as it will be when Christ is felt to be bearing it for us, is fruitful of blessing. Paul's trials were in a special sense "for His body's sake," for of course, if he had not preached the Gospel, he would have escaped them all; and on the other hand, they have been especially fruitful of good, for if he had not been persecuted, he would never have written these precious letters from Rome. The Church owes much to the violence which has shut up confessors in dungeons. The prison literature, beginning with this letter, and ending with "Pilgrim's Progress," has been among its most cherished treasures.

But the same thing is true about us all, though it may be in a narrower sphere. No man gets good for himself alone out of his sorrows. Whatever purifies and makes gentler and more Christlike, whatever teaches or builds up—and sorrows rightly borne do all these—is for the common good. Be our trials great or small, be they minute and every-day,—like gnats that hum about us in clouds, and may be swept away by the hand, and irritate rather than hurt where they sting,—or be they huge and formidable, like the viper that clings to the wrist and poisons the life blood, they are meant to give us good gifts, which we may transmit

to the narrow circle of our homes, and in every widening ring of influence to all around us. Have we never known a household, where some chronic invalid, lying helpless perhaps on a sofa, was a source of the highest blessing and the centre of holy influence, that made every member of the family gentler, more self-denying and loving? We shall never understand our sorrows, unless we try to answer the question, What good to others is meant to come through me by this? Alas that grief should so often be self-absorbed, even more than joy is! The heart sometimes opens to unselfish sharing of its gladness with others; but it too often shuts tight over its sorrow, and seeks solitary indulgence in the luxury of woe. Let us learn that our brethren claim benefit from our trials, as well as from our good things, and seek to ennoble our griefs by bearing them for "His body's sake, which is the Church."

Christ's sufferings on His cross are the satisfaction for a world's sins, and in that view can have no supplement, and stand alone in kind. But His "afflictions"—a word which would not naturally be applied to His death—do work also to set the pattern of holy endurance, and to teach many a lesson; and in that view every suffering borne for Him and with Him may be regarded as associated with His, and helping to bless the Church and the world. God makes the rough iron of our natures into shining, flexible, sharp steel, by heavy hammers and hot furnaces, that He may shape us as His instruments to help and heal.

It is of great moment that we should have such thoughts of our sorrows whilst their pressure is upon us, and not only when they are past. "I *now* rejoice." Most of us have had to let years stretch between us and the blow before we could attain to that clear insight. We can look back and see how our past sorrows tended to bless us, and how Christ

was with us in them; but as for this one, that burdens us to-day, we cannot make it out. We can even have a solemn thankfulness not altogether unlike joy as we look on those that we remember; but how hard it is to feel it about those that pain us now! There is but one way to secure that calm wisdom, which feels their meaning even while they sting and burn, and can smile through tears, as sorrowful and yet always rejoicing; and that is to keep in very close communion with our Lord. Then, even when in the whitest heat of the furnace, we may have the Son of man with us; and if we have, the fiercest flames will burn up nothing but the chains that bind us, and we shall "walk at liberty" in that terrible heat, because we walk with Him. It is a high attainment of Christian fortitude and faith to feel the blessed meaning, not only of the six tribulations which are past, but of the present seventh, and to say, even while the iron is entering the quivering flesh, "I now rejoice in my sufferings," and try to turn them to others' good.

II. These thoughts naturally lead on to the statement of the Apostle's lowly and yet lofty conception of his office—"whereof (that is, of which *Church*) I was made a minister, according to the dispensation of God, which was given me to you-ward, to fulfil the word of God."

The first words of this clause are used at the close of the preceding section, in verse 23, but the "whereof" there refers to the Gospel, not as here to the Church. He is the servant of both, and because he is the servant of the Church he suffers, as he has been saying. The representation of himself as servant gives the reason for the conduct described in the previous clause. Then the next words explain what makes him the Church's servant. He is so in accordance with, or in pursuance of, the stewardship, or office of administrator, of His household, to which God had called him, "to you-ward," that is to say, with especial reference to the Gentiles. And the final purpose of his being made

a steward is "to fulfil the word of God"; by which is not meant "to accomplish or bring to pass its predictions," but "to bring to completion," or "to give full development to," and that possibly in the sense of preaching it fully, without reserve, and far and wide throughout the whole world.

So lofty and yet so lowly was Paul's thought of his office. He was the Church's servant, and therefore bound to suffer cheerfully for their sake. He was so because a high honour had been conferred on him by God, nothing less than the stewardship of His great household the Church, in which he had to give to every man his portion, and to exercise authority. He is the Church's servant indeed, but it is because he is his Lord's steward. And the purpose of his appointment goes far beyond the interests of any single Church, for while his office sends him especially to the Colossians, its scope is as wide as the world.

One great lesson to be learned from these words is that *Stewardship means service*; and we may add that, in nine cases out of ten, service means suffering. What Paul says, if we put it into more familiar language, is just this: "Because God has given me something that I can impart to others, I am their servant, and bound, not only by my duty to Him, but by my duty to them, to labour that they may receive the treasure." And that is true for us all. Every gift from the great Householder involves the obligation to impart it. It makes us His stewards and our brethren's servants. We have that we may give. The possessions are the Householder's, not ours, even after He has given them to us. He gives us truths of various kinds in our minds, the Gospel in our hearts, influence from our position, money in our pockets, not to lavish on self, nor to hide and gloat over in secret, but that we may transmit His gifts, and "God's grace fructify through us to all." "It is required of stewards that a man be found faithful"; and the hon-

viest charge, "that he had wasted his Lord's goods," lies against every one of us who does not use all that he possesses, whether of material or intellectual or spiritual good, for the common advantage.

But that common obligation of stewardship presses with special force on those who say that they are Christ's servants. If we are, we know something of His love and have felt something of His power; and there are hundreds of people around us, many of whom we can influence, who know nothing of either. That fact makes us their servants, not in the sense of being under their control, or of taking orders from them, but in the sense of gladly working for them, and recognising obligation to help them. Our resources may be small. The Master of the house may have entrusted us with little. Perhaps we are like the boy with the five barley loaves and two small fishes; but even if we had only a bit of the bread and a tail of one of the fishes, we must not eat our morsel alone. Give it to those who have none, and it will multiply as it is distributed, like the barrel of meal, which did not fail because its poor owner shared it with the still poorer prophet. Give, and not only give, but "pray them with much entreaty to receive the gift"; for men need to have the true Bread pressed on them, and they will often throw it back, or drop it over a wall, as soon as your back is turned, as beggars do in our streets. We have to win them by showing that we are their servants, before they will take what we have to give. And besides this, if stewardship is service, service is often suffering; and he will not clear himself of his obligations to his fellows, or his responsibility to his Master, who shrinks from seeking to make known the love of Christ to his brethren, because he has often to "go forth weeping" whilst he bears "the precious seed."

III. So we come to the last thought here, which is of the grand Mystery of which Paul is the Apostle and Servant.

Paul always catches fire when he comes to think of the universal destination of the Gospel, and of the honour put upon him as the man to whom the task was entrusted of transforming the Church from a Jewish sect to a world-wide society. That great thought now sweeps him away from his more immediate object, and enriches us with a burst which we could ill spare from the letter.

His task, he says, is to give its full development to the Word of God, to proclaim a certain mystery long hid, but now revealed to those who are consecrated to God. To these it has been God's good pleasure to show the wealth of glory which is contained in this mystery, as exhibited among the Gentile Christians, which mystery is nothing else than the fact that Christ dwells in or among these Gentiles, of whom the Colossians are part, and by His dwelling in them gives them the confident expectation of future glory.

The mystery then of which the Apostle speaks so rapturously is the fact that the Gentiles were fellow heirs and partakers of Christ. "Mystery" is a word borrowed from the ancient systems, in which certain rites and doctrines were communicated to the initiated. There are several allusions to them in Paul's writings, as for instance in the passage in Philippians iv. 12, which the Revised Version gives as "I have learned the secret both to be filled and to be hungry," and probably in the immediate context here, where the characteristic word "perfect" means "initiated." Portentous theories which have no warrant have been spun out of this word. The Greek mysteries implied secrecy; the rites were done in deep obscurity, the esoteric doctrines muttered in the ear: but the Christian mysteries are spoken on the housetop. Nor does the word *mystery* imply anything as to the comprehensibility of the doctrine or fact which is so called.

We talk about "mysteries," meaning thereby truths that

transcend human faculties ; but the New Testament "mystery" may be, and most frequently is, a fact perfectly comprehensible when once spoken. "Behold, I show you a mystery : We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." There is nothing incomprehensible in that. We should never have known it if we had not been told ; but when told it is quite level with our faculties. And as a matter of fact, the word is most frequently used in connexion with the notion, not of concealment, but of declaring. We find too that it occurs frequently in this Epistle, and in the parallel one to the Ephesians, and in every instance but one refers, as it does here, to a fact which was perfectly plain and comprehensible when once made known ; namely, the entrance of the Gentiles into the Church.

If that be the true meaning of the word, then "a steward of the mysteries" will simply mean a man who has truths, formerly unknown but now revealed, in charge to make known to all who will hearken, and neither the claims of a priesthood nor the demand for the unquestioning submission of the intellect have any foundation in this much abused term.

But turning from this, we may briefly consider what was the substance of this grand mystery which thrilled Paul's soul. It is the wonderful fact that all barriers were broken down, and that Christ dwelt in the hearts of these Colossians. He saw in that the proof and the prophecy of the world-wide destination of the Gospel. No wonder that his heart burned as he thought of the marvellous work which God had wrought by him. For there is no greater revolution in the history of the world than that accomplished through him, the cutting loose of Christianity from Judaism and widening the Church to the width of the race. No wonder that he was misunderstood and hated by Jewish Christians all his days !

He thinks of these once heathens and now Christians at

Colossæ, far away in their lonely valley, and of many another little community—in Judæa, Asia, Greece, and Italy; and as he thinks of how the tide of God's redeeming love in Jesus Christ had risen over all the separating rocks of race and religion, and had united these isolated pools and lakelets into a great sea, the vision of the oneness of mankind in the Cross of Christ shines out before him, as no man had ever seen it till then, and he triumphs in the sorrows that had helped to bring about the great result.

That dwelling of Christ among the Gentiles reveals the exuberant abundance of glory. To him the "mystery" was all running over with riches, and blazing with fresh radiance. To us it is familiar and somewhat worn. The "vision splendid," which was manifestly a revelation of hitherto unknown Divine treasures of mercy and lustrous light when it first dawned on the Apostle's sight, has "faded" somewhat "into the light of common day" for us, to whom the centuries since have shown so slow a progress. But let us not lose more than we can help, either by our familiarity with the thought, or by the discouragements arising from the chequered history of its partial realization. Christianity is still the only religion which has been able to make permanent conquests. It is the only one that has been able to disregard latitude and longitude, and to address and guide conditions of civilization and modes of life quite unlike those of its origin. It is the only one that sets itself the task of conquering the world without the sword, and has kept true to the design for centuries. It is the only one whose claims to be world-wide in its adaptation and destiny would not be laughed out of court by its history. It is the only one which is to-day a missionary religion. And so, notwithstanding the long centuries of arrested growth and the wide tracts of remaining darkness, the mystery which

fired Paul's enthusiasm is still able to kindle ours, and the wealth of glory that lies in it has not been impoverished nor stricken with eclipse.

One last thought is here,—that the possession of Christ is the pledge of future blessedness. "Hope" here seems to be equivalent to "the source" or "ground" of the hope. If we have the experience of His dwelling in our hearts, we shall have in that very experience of His sweetness and of the intimacy of His love a marvellous quickener of our hope that such sweetness and intimacy will continue for ever. The closer we keep to Him, the clearer will be our vision of future blessedness. If He is throned in our hearts, we shall be able to look forward with a hope which is not less than certainty to the perpetual continuance of His hold of us and of our blessedness in Him. Anything seems more credible to a man who habitually has Christ abiding in him, than that such a trifle as death should have power to end such a union. To have Him is to have life. To have Him will be heaven. To have Him is to have a hope certain as memory and careless of death or change.

That hope is offered to us all. If by our faith in His great sacrifice we grasp the great truth of "Christ for us," our fears will be scattered, sin and guilt taken away, death abolished, condemnation ended, the future a hope and not a dread. If by communion with Him through faith, love, and obedience, we have "Christ in us," our purity will grow, and our experience will be such as plainly to demand eternity to complete its incompleteness and to bring its folded buds to flower and fruit. If Christ be in us, His life guarantees ours, and we cannot die while He lives. The world has come, in the persons of its leading thinkers, to proclaim that all is dark beyond and above. "Behold! we know not anything" is the dreary "end of the whole matter"—infinitely sadder than the old Ecclesiastes, which from "vanity of vanities" climbed to "fear God and keep

His commandments," as the sum of human thought and life. "I find no God; I know no future." Yes! Paul long ago told us that if we were "without Christ" we should "have no hope, and be without God in the world." And cultivated Europe is finding out that to fling away Christ and to keep a faith in God or in a future life is impossible.

But if we will take Him for our Saviour by simple trust, He will give us His own presence in our hearts, and infuse there a hope full of immortality. If we live in close communion with Him, we shall need no other assurance of an eternal life beyond than the deep, calm blessedness of the imperfect fellowship of earth which must needs lead to and be lost in the everlasting and completed union of heaven.

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

A CRITICAL ESTIMATE.

SECOND PAPER.

WE were somewhat surprised to find that the O. T. Revisers did not leave the Proper Names as they stood in the A. V. They have tried to carry out the A. V.'s system of transliteration "with somewhat greater consistency," leaving unchanged "names which by usage have become English." The changes will probably not be much noticed. We have Ije-abarim for Iye-abarim, Habazziniah for Habaziniah, Kir-heres for Kir-haresh, Jeshurun for Jesurun. Azareel becomes Azarel, which seems no nearer the true pronunciation A'zarêl. Kiriath-jearim is in equal danger of mispronunciation. If conservatism forbade Kiryath, the Kirjath of A. V. should have been left. And why, if it was right to

alter Chittim to Kittim, does *ch* still stand for *k* in Chebar, Maschil, and Maachah?

The rule of the N. T. Company was to amend only "persons and places mentioned in the O.T.," as in substituting Jeremiah for Jeremy, Isaiah for Esaias, Elijah for Elias. The O. T. Company at least did wisely not to return the compliment in the case of Hebrew names recurring in the N. T. and known best in that connexion. It is a help to the reader to distinguish the "John" and "Ananias" of the O.T. as Johanan and Hananiah, and ignore the identity of nomenclature. The truth is, this subject of names has long passed out of range of scientific treatment. The Saviour's name is everywhere known as "Jesus," "Jesu," "Yesu," "Isa," etc., instead of *Yeshu*, or *Yeshua*. Yet in English the alternative form "*Joshua*" survives, and its identification with "Jesus" devolves on the commentator. The chosen people is "Israel," not *Jisrael*. Consistency would demand "*Izreel*" for *Jezreel*, and so this name was spelt in the Genevan Bible of 1560. This version, we notice, takes credit for "restoring many of the . . . Ebrewe names to the true writing and first originall whereof they have their signification." Our search has only been rewarded by "*Izhak*," "*Jaakob*," and "*Izreel*" aforesaid, three as unacceptable corrections as could be made. The rule in 1611, on the other hand, was that names should "be retained as nigh as may be accordingly as they are vulgarly used." Vulgar use meant approximately the Vulgate's use. The *sh* in names was, on such principles, a fertile source of confusion. In familiar cases the Vulgate's *s* had been popularized; thus "Moses" still represents *Mosheh*. But English tongues had not faithfully endorsed the mispronunciation of the Ephraimites of old. The same verb or noun accordingly appeared in different derivatives now with *s*, now with *sh*, and the common origin of many names is thus still obscured to the English reader. Thus

the A.V. retains the *sh* in Shimei, Ishmael, Shemaiah, but gives *s* in Simeon and Ismaiah, all derivatives of *shâma*, "to hear." The N.T. form "Solomon" stands as the English equivalent of Sh'lomoh; yet the kindred names Shallum and Shelemiah survive in true Hebrew garb. We retain "Shem" (albeit perversely calling his descendants' tongue "Semitic"), and elide the *sh* in Samuel, which is probably from the very same root. The malevolent scribe remains Shimshai, but Shimshon the mighty judge is disguised as Samson. Chavvah, "the mother of all living," is hopelessly severed from the cognate verb, noun, and adjective, and we almost regret that the suggestive Ζωή of LXX. in Gen. iii. 20 ever gave place to *Eḡa*, whence Vulg. "Heva" and our "Eve." In Jude v. 11 "Core" (usually read as a monosyllable) was bravely re-identified by the N.T. Revisers with "Korah." Was it impossible to favour further "the lively phrase of the Ebrewe," and give "Bilaam" in the same verse, as a lead to the O. T. Company? Certainly three grand chapters in Numbers are spoilt for public reading by the gratuitous consonancy of Balaam and Balak in repeated juxtaposition. The rhythm is marred, and the *ιδιότης* gets "mixed" between the king and the recalcitrant prophet.

We now approach the subject of the alterations of translation. No books we may say, by way of preface, have ever been quoted so recklessly as these O.T. Scriptures. It is not too much to say that one-half the texts best known to the public are familiarized by misapplication. This usage has ancient warrant. The great Rabbis have always loved to make the letter of Scripture a vehicle for new thoughts, and even to preface such an application by the words "that the Scripture might be established," "to establish the Scriptures," etc. But then there is little deception about this Jewish method of citation; sometimes indeed its rationale is obviously a mere pun, or play on words. We, with our

modern ideas of accuracy, our inability to put ourselves in the original time and place, our wholly different view of the Hebrew literature, cannot afford this method of citation. Its tendency with us is to propagate error, and so indirectly to disparage revealed religion. If the R.V. in any way tends to make people think and study before they apply texts, it will be a gain to religion and education. In some cases indeed no translation can serve as a corrective. Thus the word "Mizpah," and the text, "The Lord watch between me and thee," will doubtless still be used as the indication of mutual affection and prayerful sympathy. In the original (Gen. xxxi. 49) both are as remote from such ideas as was our own recent "sacred covenant" with Russia. Mizpah was a monument demarcating the scientific frontier of two relations who could not live in harmony, and the text is a curse on him who should break the pact. But we trust in other cases the revised translation will be effective. "*Their strength is to sit still*" (Isa. xxx. 7) is a noted offender. "Therefore have I called her *Rahab that sitteth still*" is sufficiently near the mark to cheer those who would have Isaiah quoted as he wrote. We prefer however, "I have cried concerning this, *Rahab doth but sit still*;" for Rahab as the nickname of Egypt was not Isaiah's invention, but occurs twice, as the R.V. itself shows, in the older book of Job (ix. 13, xxvi. 12). Another impostor (*quâ* devotional usage) is Ps. lxviii. 11. Some years back we received a form of mission-prayers issued by high ecclesiastical authority, in which were the versicles, "O Lord, give the word": "Great shall be the company of the *preachers*." The quotation was from the Prayer-book Psalter, but the more accurate version of the A.V. equally fails to indicate that the so-called "preachers" are females. The R.V. sufficiently shows that the text treats merely of Eastern women publishing with joyous acclamation the tidings of a victory. The Prayer-book version again is re-

sponsible for the popular comparison of "*young children*," to "arrows in the hand of the giant." It was not babies of whom the Psalmist was thinking. He meant "children of a man's youth," who should be in the prime of manhood when the parent was aged and required defence. Here, as so often, the R.V. in aiming at reproduction of the Hebrew idiom becomes obscure. "*Children of youth*" is of course right, but will it be always understood? Why not say "children begotten in youth," which would be plain to all? Yet again certain good people appear to find a singular beauty in the metaphor of the Lord "*making up his jewels*," Mal. iii. 17. The R.V. rightly gives, "And they shall be mine, in the day that I *do make, even a peculiar treasure*." "Vanity and *vexation of spirit*" is a phrase familiar to all, the alliteration perhaps accounting for its popularity. But we hold it certain that the Preacher used no such combination. Here, however, we hardly understand the principles on which the Revisers act in giving "*striving after wind*." The words רעות רוח may be interpreted by Hos. xii. 1, where the R.V. retains "Ephraim *feedeth on wind*." Or we can render "companionship with what profits not." But is it not best to interpret רעות and רעיון here by the acknowledged use of רעיון in Daniel, and to render "*unprofitable thought*." Surely the Aramaisms in Ecclesiastes are undeniable. "Vexation" can of course be got from the root רעע, but "striving after" is to us inexplicable, unless it be a periphrasis for the bolder Hebrew idiom "companionship with." Yet it is a periphrasis which conveys no sense to English ears.

Many an uninstructed reader will lament the disappearance of what he regarded as a Messianic prophecy in Haggai ii. 7. But "*the desire of all nations shall come*" is an impossible rendering. A little study, moreover, will show how appropriate is the emendation "*desirable things*" for "desire." The poverty of the second Temple had roused

regretful reminiscences in the minds of aged lookers on. Haggai foretells that treasure shall be contributed thereto by Gentile proselytes, adding that "the silver" and "the gold" are at the disposal of the Lord of hosts. Every reader will at least rejoice in the disappearance of the meaningless "not" in the noted prophecy which is read on Christmas Day. Isaiah as a whole was badly translated in 1611, but it seems marvellous that the K'ri "*to him*," for C'thib "*not*," only found expression in the margin of Isa. ix. 2. Equally inexcusable was the adaptation¹ of Isa. xxv. 8 to the N.T. citation, "Death is swallowed up *in victory*." The words can only mean "He hath swallowed up death *for ever*," as R.V. (this time without any annotation). We have nothing to do here with subsequent writers. But St. Paul's adoption of what was doubtless a popular form of the passage is deeply interesting, as showing how the Aramaic usage of the root נצח had already led the Jews to attach a wrong sense to this Scripture. Aquila also gives *eis vîkos*.

Job xix. 25-27 has often been treated as if expressing a faith in the future Messiah, and an assurance of the Resurrection of the body. There can be little doubt that whether we translate "Redeemer," "Avenger," or "Deliverer," the first of these ideas is foreign to the thoughts of the writer. The second may be present, though such assurance is rare indeed in the O.T. But is there any clear sense in the passage as translated in the R.V.? We fail to find it. Here (as in so many of the Psalms) the aimlessness of Committee-work is discernible. The component parts have seemingly been discussed and voted on without regard to the whole. The rendering of v. 27 retained from the A.V. has always struck us as a notable instance of unintelligible Hebrew-English,—"*Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another.*"—Word for word right, but which of two senses is given depends on the reader's

¹ For similar adaptations in A.V. see Isa. xl. 3; Amos v. 26; Ps. xxii. 8.

emphasis. If "myself," "mine," "another," be emphasized, it means—Job shall see the Redeemer, but others (*scil.* his opponents) shall not; and so Delitzsch still interprets. If read, as in the original, with no emphasis whatever on "myself" and "mine," but a strong one on "see," "behold," "another," it need mean only—Job shall see his Redeemer and no other but Him. The latter sense we prefer. But what can be said of a translation which depends on the accident of our emphasis? We shall say more on such points anon. We will only here ask the reader, would he tolerate vague literalism of this sort in a translation of a stiff passage in Æschylus or Thucydides?

The "*rose of Sharon*" (Song ii. 1) is a familiar misappellation, and Goss' well-known anthem incorporates the words, "The desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose," from Isa. xxxv. 1. Yet the genuine "rose" has no equivalent in Biblical Hebrew, and the later term for the flower is very different from חבצלת. Its etymology proves that this word indicates a "bulbous" plant, probably either a crocus or a narcissus. Why do the Revisers do less justice to this than to the other botanical terms of the O.T.? They retain the incorrect "rose" of A.V. and relegate ¹ "*autumn crocus*" to the margin? Feeble humourists have often attributed to cynical reviewers the desire of Job, "Oh . . . that mine adversary had written *a book!*" (xxx. 35.) The passage of course really expresses Job's readiness to answer the *libellum* or *indictment* of his adversary. The Revisers' view of the construction is perhaps preferable to that adopted by Delitzsch. In Ps. civ. 4, the R.V. rightly gives, "Who maketh *winds his messengers*," for "Who maketh *his angels spirits*." But it is bad scholarship to continue the verse, "*and his ministers a flaming fire*." The

¹ With the usual meaningless "or" prefixed. We suppose here "or" = *id est*. What is to be said of annotations in which synonyms and diversities of interpretation are indicated by one and the same symbol!

parallelism is introverted, but the clause certainly means, when done into English, "*and the lightning flames his ministers.*" In Ps. xlv. 13, we notice with approval, "The king's daughter *within [the palace] is all glorious,*" for "*is all glorious within.*" Ps. lxviii. 16 is also correctly rendered, "*Why look ye askance, ye high mountains?*" [*scil.* at the glory of the lowly Zion,] and doubtless, "*Why hop ye so?*" will one day be as extinct as the church-clerk psalmody which it suggests. In Gen. i. 21, "great *whales*" rightly gives place to "great *sea monsters.*" In Gen. xix. 1, the translation, "*The two men,*" is correct; the third being the Divine collocutor of chap. xviii. In Job xxxviii. 31, the "*sweet influences of the Pleiades*" is rightly altered to "*cluster of the Pleiades.*" Ps. cxvi. 11, "I said in my haste, All men are *liars,*" is well-known, but is inaccurate. R.V. gives "All men are *a lie,*" *i.e.* a failure in time of need. This may stand; but we would also substitute "*distraction*" for "*haste.*"

In selecting these passages, we have been thinking of what is familiar to the public. We hope hereafter to deal with the R.V. translations categorically from the scholar's point of view. This will necessitate discussion on the object and scope of translation-work generally. To clear the way, we notice here the "archaisms" which we regret to find retained in the R.V. It is degrading to descend to these miserable details, but the Revisers' principles of translation necessitate it. It consoles us to learn from their Preface that we share our disappointment with "the large English-speaking race on the other side of the Atlantic." Perhaps in this case the wise men have not come from the East. The English Company retains "bolled"; "rereward" = rearguard; "bruit"; "tabering"; "daysman"; "helve"; "neesings" = sneezings; "silverlings"; "knop"; "meteyard"; "ouch"; "post" = relays of messengers; "prevent" = forestall; "let it" = reverse it; "calamus" = sugar-cane;

"fray" = frighten; "ringstraked" = piebald. "Comfortable" in the sense "comforting" is retained, and "amiable" is applied to the Temple in the sense "worthy of love." Not only is "astonied" conserved, but in Ezekiel iii. 15 it is substituted for "astonished," the reader being left to perplex himself about the subtle distinction. We have "this liketh you" for "this is what you like"; and "captivity" for "captives." On this last we notice that the Hebrew שְׁבוּת = either "turn the captivity" or "restore the captives," according to the context, but that the R.V. "bring back the captivity" means either or neither. The archaism "captivity" is surely sufficiently condemned by its use (or misuse) in the hymn lines, "Songs of praise arose when He Captive led *captivity*." Of course "captivity" is taken to mean the power that held men captive. Yet the Hebrew Psalmist (Ps. lxxviii. 18), and the Apostle who quoted him in the words of the LXX., meant nothing of the kind. "Thou hast taken a *band of captives*" is all that is intended in modern idiom. In this Psalm the R.V. effects a curious compromise with its fetish. It gives "Thou hast led [thy] captivity captive."

Other archaisms may be noticed as less conspicuous, but equally objectionable. Thus the typical housewife of Prov. xxxi. 10 is still called the "*virtuous*" woman. The phrase was in the Geneva Version, and singularly enough the LXX. had ἀνδραγαθή, "*virtuous*" in a more literal sense. But the adjective can only be applied here in the sense in which Chaucer applied it to his Servitour, *scil.* as "useful," "serviceable." "*A capable wife*" or "*woman*" is the exact meaning of the Hebrew. Virtuous, as applied to a female now, has a restricted meaning, which makes the rendering "Who can find a virtuous woman?" most objectionable. Babies are still "*short-coated*," but surely "*coat*" no longer represents to our ears the tunic of an Oriental woman. The verse, "I have put off my coat," etc. (Song

v. 3) is probably put by careless readers in the mouth of the male collocutor. "*Dress*" would be intelligible and sufficiently explicit. We particularly object to the archaisms "her *pleasant* things"=things she delights in, "*pleasant* vessel"=precious vessel, "*pleasant* bread"=dainty food, "*pleasant* child," "*pleasant* plant"=child or plant that gives pleasure. Our language is now enriched by an undefined but intelligible distinction between "*pleasant*" and "*pleasing*," and the former should not be used in the sense of the latter. How will common folk understand the words, "An evil, *an only* evil: behold, it cometh"? (Ezek. vii. 5.) Of course, as a prophecy of an evil which shall be *unqualified* by good. But this is not the sense the A.V. and the R.V. intend. The Hebrew means either "*a single* evil," a special, unassociated infliction, or "*a unique* evil," one unparalleled in history. The latter sense of "*only*" is now unknown; the former is obsolete, without a possessive pronoun, save in regard to close relationships, as "*an only son*," "*an only sister*." "*Stuff*" seems to us a very unhappy rendering for כְּלִים, "*effects*," or "*outfit*." In Jer. xli. 19, Ezek. xii. 3, the original gives us the phrase "*prepare an emigrant's (or exile's) outfit*." The R.V. gives in one case, "*furnish thyself to go into captivity*," in the other, "*prepare thee stuff for removing*," both savouring of vague pedantry. In Ezek. xvi. 27, who will understand the expression, "*thy ordinary food*"? The term in 1611 had a force which survives to-day only in the "*ordinary*" of inns. "*Thy rations*" would exactly reproduce the Hebrew expression; if "*rations*" be too suggestive of military life, why not say "*thy allowance of food*"? Equally obsolete is the idiom, "*those that served themselves of them*," Ezek. xxxiv. 27, as the Revisers confess by attaching a note, "*or, made bondmen of them*." "*For the sake of*" is now used in *bonam partem* only: the ground should have been cursed "*on account of*" man, and the

storm sent "*on account of Jonah*" (Gen. viii. 21, Jon. i. 12). The phrase, "utter the memory of," Ps. cxlv. 7, no longer="proclaim the fame of." How will the unintelligent understand the words, "Tell him I am *sick of love*"? Of course as meaning "disgusted with love," not "love-sick," as the writer meant. What sense is conveyed to modern ears by the term "*several house*"? Not every hearer or reader will perceive from the context that it was a hospital, or place of prolonged quarantine, to which the leprous king Ahaziah withdrew himself. Lastly, how many people moderately versed in architecture know that the "*chapter*" of a pillar is its capital?¹

The Revisers' defence is broadly, that they thought the English language would be impoverished by the elimination from a Bible-translation of terms confessedly obsolete. They also argue that the archaisms they choose to retain are, "although obsolete, not unintelligible." We question if their patronage will prolong by a day the tenure of words which public opinion has evicted. We are sure that not half the terms cited above are intelligible to any but students. And deeming it of great importance that the Scriptures should be rightly understood, we regard this deference to pseudo-antiquarianism as discreditable alike to our scholarship and our religious feeling. Cannot the dilettante archæologist rest content with Wardour Street art, and "restorations," and "serio-comic-Gothic" architecture? Must a like tasteless pedantry infest the realm of literature, and dim the lustre of our great Hebrew Classics?

¹ In enumerating these instances of pedantry we do not overlook the fact that a great many archaisms have been expunged. "Lamp" in Gen. xiii., Judg. vii., etc., has given place to its modern equivalent, "torch"; "carriages" to baggage; "artillery" to weapons; "cotes" to folds; "habergeon" to coat of mail; "organ" (Gen. iv. 21) to pipe; "taches" to clasps; "earring" to plowing. Apropos of "earring" the Revisers' apology for its disappearance amusingly illustrates their knowledge of their readers' wants. We are truly grateful that Shakespeare used "its" ten times, and that the word "meal-offering" is very like the old "meat-offering" of A.V. (*vide* Preface, pp. vi.-viii.).

Or is it the Canterbury Convocation again and the popular view of the A.V. that impel the Revisers to pay this tribute to obscurity?

The truth is no translator of Oriental literature can afford to hark back to an imaginary Augustan age of English, and ignore the linguistic fruits of later time and more extended travel. The modernisms of to-day are ever the "grand old English" of the morrow. Besides, what the Hebrew writers meant was sometimes barely expressible in the English of 1611. The object surely is to put readers *en rapport*, not with King James's divines, but with the Hebrew prophets and historians. We gladly recognise the merits of the A.V. It was a wonderful translation for the age which produced it. We admit too that the accidents of political and religious history made this version a powerful agency in the formation of our vernacular. No new version of the Scriptures will ever affect popular diction in the same way. All the more reason why the two companies should have laid aside all affectations of style, and tried simply to produce what thinking people demand and unthinking people need—an accurate and lucid Bible translation.

Thus, since Isaiah (xxxv. 7) certainly mentions the "*mirage*," we hold the faithful translator is bound to use the term, and not "glowing sand," as R.V. Doubtless the phenomenon was not familiar to Shakespeare or the A.V. translators, and the word was apparently unknown in France till 1809. But what has that to do with Isaiah? The Arabs still use the very term Isaiah used, and it means "mirage." Knowledge of the phenomenon and its nomenclature brings us moderns nearer to Isaiah than the A.V. translators were. So again, if our increased acquaintance with the East has given us the term "*palæquin*," the Revisers need have no *arrière pensée* about having given this word in Song iii. 9, albeit its use is not discoverable before

1655. No other term gives the sense of the Hebrew writer. If the "*harem*" of Ahasuerus is certainly mentioned in Esther ii., the word should be welcomed as more suggestive of the time, place, and surroundings than "house of the women," though the latter is strictly correct. And so with all Oriental usages and metaphors, save where the latter¹ are meaningless to English ears. If all "bottles" in the East were skin-bags, let us read "*skins*" or "*bags*" or "*skin-bags*" wherever practicable, and not only where the epithet puts glass bottles out of the question, as in Josh. ix. 4; Matt. ix. 17. The *noses* of modern English women are not graced with rings. But fashions were different in the Mesopotamia of B.C. 1800, and the nose-ring is an Oriental ornament to this day. We may therefore congratulate the Revisers on not reproducing the A.V.'s prudish evasion of this characteristic detail in Rebekah's garniture (Gen. xxiv. 22, 47). So again we do not liken a lady to a "mare" with any complimentary intention. But it is otherwise in the East; and if the lover in Song i. 9 chooses to compare his bride to "a *mare* in Pharaoh's chariots," why cannot our Revisers faithfully reproduce the simile, instead of using the epicene term "*steed*"? The Jewish צַנִּיף is known to all of us as a "*turban*"; why use the term "*diadem*" or (still worse) "*mitre*," both which will suggest a head-dress of an entirely different kind?

A. C. JENNINGS.

W. H. LOWE.

¹ On the retention of Hebrew metaphors, idioms, and *façons de parler*, unintelligible to all but students, we shall speak in our next paper.

THE FAYÛM GOSPEL FRAGMENT.

I.

THE following is a copy of the Fayûm Gospel Fragment as restored by Dr. Bickell. We place in parallel columns the corresponding passages from the Gospels of SS. Matthew and Mark.

Μετὰ δὲ τὸ φαγεῖν ὡς ἐξῆγον· πάντες ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νύκτι σκανδαλισθήσεσθε κατὰ τὸ γραφέν· πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα καὶ τὰ πρόβατα διασκορπισθήσονται. Εἰπόντος τοῦ Πέτρου· καὶ εἰ πάντες οὐκ ἐγώ. ἔφη αὐτῷ· ὁ ἀλεκτρυὼν δις κοκκίζει καὶ σὺ πρῶτον τρεῖς ἀπαρνήσῃ με.

ST. MARK xiv. 26-30: Καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἑλαιῶν.

Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοί· ὅτι γέγραπται· πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα καὶ διασκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα. Ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με, προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἔφη αὐτῷ· Καὶ εἰ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγώ. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ὅτι σὺ σήμερον ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ, πρὶν ἢ δις ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι, τρεῖς μὲ ἀπαρνήσῃ.

ST. MATT. xxvi. 30-34: Καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἑλαιῶν.

Τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Πάντες ὑμεῖς σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοί ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ· γέγραπται γάρ, Πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποιμένης. Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Εἰ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοί, ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε σκανδαλισθήσομαι. Ἐφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ὅτι ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ, πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι, τρεῖς ἀπαρνήσῃ με.

II.

In May last I gave the readers of THE EXPOSITOR an account of the great collection of documents from Fayûm preserved principally at Vienna and Berlin. We may hope before long to have the materials for forming an independent judgment upon them, as we are promised the speedy publication of a *Corpus Papyrorum Renieri Archi-*

ducis, which will enable every competent critic to draw his own conclusions and to test those which have already been drawn. I described in my article some of the Biblical texts which Dr. K. Wessely has published, dating from the fifth century, and mentioned in passing, as I had already in the *Contemporary Review* for December, 1884, that a text of St. Matthew belonging to the third century had also come to light. That document has now been published. The papyrus in question is not a text of St. Matthew or of any Gospel, in the sense of being a full and complete text. It is only a minute fragment, grievously mutilated and shattered, but still of immense interest even in that condition, and raising very important and interesting questions concerning the original sources of the Gospel narrative. The document has been published by a distinguished orientalist, Dr. G. Bickell, Professor of Christian Archæology in the University of Innsbruck, in a Roman Catholic review, the *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, for 1885, part iii., pp. 498-504, with a discussion which proves that in the University of Innsbruck, and in the Roman Catholic circles wherein that publication circulates, there must exist a very intelligent interest in such inquiries. But the document comes to us guaranteed by the judgment of experts as well; for Professor Karabacek, Professor Krall, and Dr. Wessely, of Vienna, have assisted Dr. Bickell, and fortified him by their decision that the document is certainly to be assigned to the third century, its writing and contractions being all of them characteristic of that period.

I have said that the manuscript is no complete text; in very deed it is only a miserable fragment, measuring not quite two inches each way. The lines are mutilated at each end, but, as restored by Bickell, contain each just twenty-eight or twenty-nine letters, which, as we know from another source (Birt, *Das Antike Buchwesen*, p. 198), was the average length of lines in all ancient papyrus books. The text of

the fragment deals with the narrative of our Lord's discourse after the last supper, and corresponds to St. Matthew xxvi. 30-34, and to St. Mark xiv. 26-30. It agrees much more nearly with St. Mark than with St. Matthew, as perhaps might have been expected in a land where the Church traces itself back to St. Mark, its first evangelist and founder; and yet its divergence from St. Mark is of a very decided character.

The following is an English translation of the fragment, which however cannot exhibit the variations as the original does, as given at the head of this article, with the corresponding passages from St. Matthew and St. Mark:

"Now after eating, as they marched out¹; You shall all be offended this night according to the Scripture, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered. Peter said, Though all, yet not I. He said to him, The cock shall crow (not the usual word, but a word we might translate 'cry cuckoo') twice, and thou shalt previously deny Me thrice."

Now when we examine this passage, where I have tried to represent in my translation the divergences from our Gospels, we notice (1) a total absence of the mention of the hymn, which is common to Matthew and Mark; (2) a total omission also of the promise by Jesus to precede the disciples into Galilee after His resurrection, which is contained in both Gospels; (3) a different word for cock and for crow from those used in all the Gospel narratives. The word *φωνῆσαι* appears in them all, and expresses in strictness merely the utterance of a sound; while the verb *κοκκύζειν* is derived from *κόκκυξ*, a cuckoo, and signifies "to cry like a cuckoo or a cock," being a verb formed in imitation of the sound which the bird utters. While lastly Bickell

¹ The verb *ἐξάγειν*, which I translate as above, is usually transitive; but it is used in an intransitive sense once in early Greek—Hom. *Il.* vii., 336,—and again in the late North African Greek of Synesius. The sense I have given to it is found also in Xen. *Hell.* vi. 5, 18.

notices the literary style as briefer, more energetic and concise, more like that of an eye-witness transferring his impressions to paper without any design of working them into literary shape and style, than the narrative of the canonical Gospels. His theory is this, that here we have traces of a Gospel which was neither canonical nor yet heretical or false, but which may have been one of those early attempts to set forth the life, work, and sufferings of our Lord to which St. Luke refers in the first verse of his preface: "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us." Of course it is very hard to form any certain conclusions from one small fragment, and from the mass of material to be examined, it may be years before other fragments turn up among these Fayûm documents. One instance indeed, which I lately came across in a Vienna journal, in which the narrative of these discoveries first saw the light, illustrates this point. The number of Greek documents, both at Berlin and Vienna, largely exceeds the Latin. At Berlin they have 2,500 Greek papyri, and only three Latin ones. One would have thought that a Latin document could not have escaped notice in such a case. Yet Wessely, in a visit to the Berlin collection in 1884, discovered a Latin one, which had eluded the keen vision of the Berlin scholars, hidden away among the mass of Greek papyri. Bickell's study of our fragment has been criticised by Dr. Harnack in *Schürer's Theologische Literaturzeitung* for June 13th, in the most searching manner. Harnack is decidedly inclined to accept it as a genuine relic of one of those primitive documents from which in his opinion St. Matthew and St. Mark have been worked up. He is evidently rejoiced at the absence of the prophecy about Christ's departure into Galilee after the resurrection, as it seems to get rid of one supernatural feature of the narrative; though indeed the

gain in this respect is not much, as the prediction about the threefold denial remains as real and supernatural a prophecy as the other. He throws out a suggestion that possibly it may not be a fragment from a Gospel of any kind, but merely a free quotation of the Gospel narrative made from memory, and embodied in a sermon or homily. He admits the possibility of this view, but considers that the overwhelming weight of evidence tends the other way, and establishes the newly found text as a real fragment of a document or class of documents from which both St. Matthew and St. Mark have been constructed. The suggestion is a natural one, that it may have been derived from the Gospel of the Egyptians which Clement of Alexandria so frequently quotes, and which seems to have been abundantly used by orthodox as well as heretics. Harnack puts this aside at once. The Gospel of the Egyptians was in his view derived from our Gospels, and not *vice versâ*.¹ In any case, one need only compare the extracts from it which Clement of Alexandria gives us, to see that the tone of it is quite different from that of the text we are now discussing. Compare, for instance, the well known reply which Jesus, according to it, made to the query as to when His kingdom shall come, "When out of two has been made one, and the outward has become as the inward, and the male with the female neither male nor female," with the historical tone and style of our extract, and the vast difference becomes manifest at once. Supposing it however, as Harnack thinks, a portion of one of the original Gospels, we cannot trace any knowledge or use of it among the Fathers. I have searched the early Egyptian writers, Origen, Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius, Cyril, and

¹ Harnack's theories as to the construction of our canonical Gospels and their relation to the Gospel of the Egyptians are rather changeable. Last year, in his edition of the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," p. 79, he seemed to think the Gospel of the Egyptians anterior to St. Matthew. This year, in his criticism of our fragment, he speaks of it as posterior to Matthew and Mark.

Nonnus of Panopolis, all of whom deal more or less with St. Peter's denial, without finding a trace of the peculiarities of this extract. Nonnus of Panopolis is a very important witness. He was a good scholar, as his works show. He wrote about the year 400 A.D. a paraphrase of St. John's Gospel, from which some important conclusions as to the text have been drawn; yet neither he nor any of the others I have mentioned apparently know anything of this text.

I have found indeed in Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*, cap. ix., and in him alone, the peculiar word for "cock" which the fragment uses, but nothing else. It must at the same time be remembered that the argument from silence is a very dangerous one. Our ignorance is no measure of human possibilities. Many writers and much criticism must have existed of which we know nothing, and many writers whom we do know have suffered grievous loss in the course of ages. How much of Origen, for instance, is lost for ever! Fayûm too was evidently a great literary and religious centre. Documents may have been preserved there unknown to those Alexandrian writers who have come down to us. The text of the Eighth Book of Thucydides, published by Wessely, belongs to the third century; yet it has never been noticed by any critic of whom history tells. The question may fairly be asked, Suppose that this be a genuine fragment of an early Gospel, what bearing has it on the estimate we now form of the canonical Gospels? Harnack indeed evidently regards it as an original text, and our present Gospels as mere expansions of it. He makes a strong point of the following comparison:

PAPYRUS: Εἰπόντος τοῦ Πέτρου· καὶ εἰ πάντες οὐκ ἐγώ.

ST. MARK: Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἔφη αὐτῷ· Εἰ καὶ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγώ.

ST. MATTHEW: Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος, εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Εἰ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοὶ, ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε σκανδαλισθήσομαι.

pointing out that the papyrus is evidently much briefer, earlier in tone, while the Gospel text seems worked up with a view to literary effect. Yet, admitting all this, the new fragment only confirms the historical accuracy of our present Gospels, and is but a new witness that in accepting them we have accepted true history and not cunningly devised fables.

GEORGE T. STOKES.

Trinity College, Dublin, June 19th.

The first part of this paper was written early in June, before any notice appeared in English of this discovery. The *Times* has had since that date some paragraphs about it, marked however by several inaccuracies. Thus Harnack has been turned into a devout Roman Catholic from a somewhat rationalistic but very strong Lutheran, while other mistakes prove the writer's want of acquaintance with theological literature. Dr. Hort has also warned the public against hasty deductions from one solitary fragment. I have already remarked that it may be years before any more fragments are found from the very richness of the mine to be worked. I lately came across a statistical table which shows this. The *Oesterreichische Monatschrift für den Orient* is the literary organ through which the Vienna investigations have been communicated to the public. It is edited by Professors Karabacek, Krall, and three other scholars of that city. German savants have been celebrated for their pugnacity since the days of Luther and Erasmus, a quality in which they are even still by no means deficient. Stern lately gave an account of the Fayûm manuscripts at Berlin, completely ignoring the Vienna collection, whereupon Karabacek wrote an article in his own journal, cutting up Stern most unmercifully. Into the merits of this controversy we have no intention of entering, but merely refer to it because Karabacek, in the

course of his argument, gives a comparative table, which illustrates one special point as to the richness of these collections, and the strange revelations which may await us there. Karabacek at any rate triumphantly demonstrates the superiority of Vienna over Berlin in almost every department, as follows :

	<i>Berlin.</i>	<i>Vienna.</i>
Greek papyri	2,500	15,000
Arabic papyri	600	4,000
Coptic papyri	300	1,000
Pehlvi papyri	100	300
Græco-Arabic papyri .	50	200
Demotic papyri	40	10
Hebrew papyri	22	23
Copto-Arabic papyri .	10	6
Tachygraphic papyri .	7	200
Latin papyri	3	34
Syriac papyri	3	2
Hieratic papyri	1	5
Hieroglyphic papyri .	0	1
Æthiopic papyri	0	200
Pap. Fragments, } cents. 8-10 }	0	163
Pictures	0	61
	<hr/> Total 3,636	<hr/> 21,204

Dr. Hort's opinion, as given through the *Times* of June 25th, will of course carry very great weight.¹ He stands in the very front rank of Biblical and textual critics, and has therefore special claims upon the attention of those of us who have not his peculiar skill and knowledge. His opinion is a very decided one. In a letter from him, which I have seen, he characterizes Dr. Bickell's discovery as "a mare's nest." Dr. Hort's view is simply this, that the fragment is only an extract from our canonical Gospels made by a good scholar who desired to improve the Greek. It may indeed

¹ Dr. Bickell replied in the *Times* of July 3rd, and in a private note has confidently asserted that Dr. Hort is mistaken. Dr. Bickell is an orthodox Roman Catholic. His teaching is far removed from German rationalism. The *Record* of July 10th seemed alarmed on this point.

be fairly enough retorted, If he wished to improve the Greek, why did he disimprove the literary style, as the Fayûm fragment is most certainly and manifestly inferior in grace and clearness to the canonical narrative? At the same time, I am bound to say that Dr. Hort's view gains support from some remains of Egyptian writers preserved by Eusebius. Dionysius of Alexandria and Phileas, Bishop of Thmuis, in the neighbourhood of the Fayûm, belong to the third century, the very period to which this fragment is referred. The Seventh Book of Eusebius is almost completely occupied with extracts from Dionysius, where free quotations and extremely free criticism of Holy Scripture appear very frequently. Phileas of Thmuis, in Eusebius *H. E.* viii. 10, quotes Philippians ii. 6-8 to a great extent in literal agreement with our present text, but, like our fragment, omits a very important clause, "made in the likeness of men," and then completely alters the eighth verse. Yet one would scarce contend that Phileas had a different text or used quite a different document from our present Epistle to the Philippians.

Without venturing on the vexed field of textual criticism, and writing merely as an ecclesiastical historian, I may venture to throw out two ideas. First, may not the fragment be a portion of a Gnostic recension of the canonical Gospels issuing from Egypt? We know that the Marcionites dealt very freely with the text of the Gospels, and others may have taken similar liberties while as yet the reverence had not gathered round the Gospel text which now encircles it. This would account for the omission of the paschal psalm, which as an Old Testament rite would be distasteful to the Gnostic mind, and also of the promise to precede the disciples into Galilee, which would of course involve that literal resurrection of the flesh which Egyptian Gnosticism rejected. Fayûm may well have been a stronghold of such views. Dionysius of Alexandria,

according to Eusebius vii. 24, had to deal with a Judaizing movement in that neighbourhood about the year 260 A.D. It may have been that such a movement was provoked by the Gnostic or rationalistic teaching of men like Origen, Hieracas, and others like them, on the subject of the resurrection and the resurrection life. Hieracas held and taught, as Origen did before him, a view very similar to that of the early Quakers, "that the future resurrection would be of the soul only, not of the material body; for all who counted it a gain to the soul to be liberated by death from the bonds of matter found it hard to believe that it could be again imprisoned in a body at the resurrection" (*Dict. Christ. Biog.* t. iii., p. 24). This Gnostic view of the resurrection was very prevalent in Egypt all through the second and third centuries. It finds a prominent place in the *Ascensio Esaiæ*, a document apparently quoted in the eleventh of Hebrews, but which in its present shape was worked up in Egypt about the time of our fragment. Again, we have another suggestion to offer. May not the fragment be a quotation from the Gospel to the Hebrews, which we know was very current in Egypt in the second and third centuries, and is often quoted by orthodox and heretics alike, by Clement, Origen, and Dionysius, by the Marcionite Apelles and by the strange Gnostic writing *Pistis Sophia*? Those who are interested in this topic would do well to consult Dr. Salmon's tenth lecture, on St. Matthew and the Gospel to the Hebrews, where the subject is fully discussed (*Introd. to N.T.* p. 194).

G. T. S.

Trinity College, July 11th.

RECENT AMERICAN LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE most recent general work on the topics of New Testament Introduction, that has appeared in America, is Mr. Houghton's translation of the veteran Reuss' *History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament*,¹ an appreciative estimate of which was given to the readers of THE EXPOSITOR by Dr. Marcus Dods, in the number for February. Parts of this broad field have been worked also in separate treatises. Dr. Schaff, for instance, has given us an admirable brief treatise on textual criticism, which he has (unfortunately, in our opinion) bound up with an account of the Authorized and Revised English Versions.² His purpose was to supply what may be called primary instruction in this imperfect science. The result, however, is probably the most accurate and careful, as well as the most concise account of the matter of criticism in English, and may be recommended to students as more trustworthy than even Dr. Scrivener's comprehensive and valuable *Plain Introduction*, and far in advance of anything else in the language. One of its useful features is a list of the printed editions of the Greek New Testament based on Reuss' *Bibliotheca Novi Testamenti Græci*, with corrections and additions,—enough additions to bring up the total to 923 items. This is the most complete bibliography in existence; it is the contribution of Prof. Isaac H. Hall, who has printed as another fruit of his bibliographical studies a separate work on American Greek Testaments.³ The first American Greek Testament was a duodecimo of 478 pages, printed by Isaiah Thomas, at Worcester, Mass., in 1800. Its title-page declared that it was "juxta exemplar Joannis Millii accuratissime impressum," though with no more truth than is usual in such

¹ *History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament*, by Edouard (Wilhelm Eugen) Reuss; translated from the fifth, revised and enlarged, German edition, with numerous bibliographical additions, by Edward L. Houghton, A.M. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1884. 2 vols. pp. x. 639, 8vo.)

² *A Companion to the Greek Testament and the English Version*, by Philip Schaff, D.D., with facsimile illustrations of new and standard editions of the New Testament. (New York: Harper & Bros., 1883. Pp. xi. 626, sm. 8vo.)

³ *A Critical Bibliography of the Greek New Testament as published in America*, by Isaac H. Hall, A.M., LL.B., Ph.D.; with two facsimile illustrations. (Philadelphia: Pickwick & Co., 1883. Pp. 82, 8vo.)

cases. Some one of Bowyer's many issues appears to have furnished the basis of the text, but it bears the mark of an independent editorial hand and exactly follows no known edition. From 1880 to 1883, Prof. Hall catalogues no less than 259 American issues of the whole or a part of the Greek Testament, which he believes to be within thirty or forty of the actual number. Some twenty-eight of these, though bearing an American imprint, were actually printed abroad. Besides them, a vast number of foreign copies have been imported. "The American consumption of the home and foreign product can scarcely fall short of half a million copies; and even that number,—enormous as it is, all things considered, in its ratio to the supply of other countries,—may be an underestimate" (p. 74). Perhaps the total world-issue of the Greek Testament has been in the neighbourhood of a million and a half, scarcely two million copies; and of these America has absorbed no less than from a quarter to a third

It will not be possible to catalogue here the numerous contributions which Prof. Hall is continually making to our knowledge of the Syriac versions, and which are generally buried in our periodicals. His most important discovery has been a MS. containing a Pre-Harkleusian version of the Gospels,—perhaps the unaltered Philoxenian itself. A full account of this Codex, which he calls the Beirût Codex, was given in the *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, for 1882. And now he has issued three beautiful phototyped pages of the MS. with descriptive letterpress.¹

The most recent American treatise on Hermeneutics is Prof. Milton S. Terry's comprehensive work,²—too comprehensive, in that it owes its inconvenient bulk to not strictly confining itself to its proper subject. More recent, and therefore more demanding notice from us, is an interesting paper by Prof. George T. Ladd (*Andover Review*, ii. pp. 18-34, July, 1884), on "The Interpretation of the Bible and the Doctrine of Sacred Scripture," the purpose of which is to show that the two are mutually dependent. Sug-

¹ *Syriac Manuscript Gospels of a Pre-Harkleusian version; Acts and Epistles of the Peshitto Version*, etc. (Philadelphia, 1884. 4to, pp. 3, with 3 phototyped plates by Gutekunst.)

² *Biblical Hermeneutics; a Treatise on the Interpretation of the Old and New Testaments*, by Milton S. Terry, S.T.D. (New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1883. Pp. 781, 8vo.)

gestive as the paper is, in our judgment it applies its idea too rigidly. So far as the contention is, either that we cannot interpret the Bible without gradually arriving at a doctrine—that is a grounded opinion—concerning it, or that no well-grounded doctrine of Sacred Scripture can be obtained apart from an exegetical study of its claims and phenomena, it is well-nigh self-evident. Must, however, our doctrine of Scripture always sway our interpretation? especially need it sway us in every process of interpretation? For Dr. Ladd asserts even this. We cannot see that text-criticism, for instance, in spite of Dr. Ladd's remarks upon it, need at all depend upon our opinion of what Scripture is. We do not need to know the nature of the Bible, nor anything, beyond its mechanical side, of its origin, in order to reconstruct the text, and the knowledge that we need have of the habits and train of thought and style of the writers is wholly apart from anything that may be justly described as a doctrine of Sacred Scripture. We owe Dr. Ladd much, however, for his fine characterization of the business of the interpreter: "The final purpose of the art of hermeneutics is the communion of souls."

So large an amount of valuable critical material is found in Prof. Fisher's latest volume,¹ that although its purpose is apologetical, it merits mention here. An interesting, though not satisfying, chapter is given to the Canon of the New Testament. And the character of Jesus, and the origin and trustworthiness of the evangelical narrative and of our Gospels are discussed very ingeniously and satisfactorily. It is convincingly shown that the supernatural claims, the sinlessness, and the miracle-working of Jesus can be established apart from any question of Gospel-criticism; and then the faithfulness of the Gospel-records themselves is vindicated—an important chapter being devoted to the Apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

The value for practical use of Prof. Toy's painstaking work on the New Testament quotations,² is greatly lessened by the vigour and rigour with which he has applied in its preparation some very vigorous and rigorous personal theories. It is designed not as a treatise on the hermeneutical principles of the New Testament writers or their attitude towards the Old Testa-

¹ *The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*, by George P. Fisher, D.D., LL.D. (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1884. Pp. xviii. 488, 8vo.)

² *Quotations in the New Testament*, by Crawford Howell Toy. (New York. C. Scribner's Sons, 1884. Pp. xlv. 32, 18mo.)

ment, but simply as a collection of the passages drawn by them from the Old Testament, with such discussion as will elucidate only the *manner* and the *justice* of their quotation. In the former matter, Prof. Toy starts with the presupposition that "the quotations in the New Testament from the Old Testament are never made immediately from the Hebrew, but always from the Greek or Aramaic version" (p. ix.), and applies it throughout, though not without visible effort at times,—and this, although it forces him to assume the existence of an oral Targum not only somewhat earlier than there is any historical trace of one, or probably there was any need of one,¹ but of a sort wholly unlike, or rather opposite to all known Targums. The latter matter depends on the exegesis of the passages involved, both in their Old and New settings,—and Prof. Toy's exegesis on the New Testament side at least, is sometimes mechanical, external and inadequate, while on the Old Testament side it is deeply affected, first by his reconstruction of Israel's history and the evolution of its literature in accordance with the findings of the school of Reuss, and secondly by his definite persuasion that "there is no room in the Old Testament thought for a double sense" (p. xxvi.), by which he apparently intends to exclude all typology as well as allegory. A book constructed in such a manner, however painstaking and however full of just and suggestive remarks (Prof. Toy's book is both), cannot but be in many parts useless to all who do not share in all its primal presumptions. When we add that the arrangement is not very convenient to the eye, and that the original texts are not in every case given, it will be seen why we do not expect this work to supersede the other current collections of Old Testament quotations in the New.

In exegesis proper, the American press has not been very prolific recently. A revision of the Edinburgh translation of Meyer's *Commentary on the New Testament*² has been in progress since

¹ We cannot go so far as Delitzsch, who, as is well-known, asserts that Hebrew and not Aramaic was the folk-tongue of the time. Nevertheless, Hebrew was not yet a dead language, as Prof. Toy asserts. Hebrew was the school-tongue, Aramaic the folk-tongue, and both were understood. Nothing else will satisfy the hints of the New Testament. As Oort justly expresses it (*Theolog. Tijdschrift*, 1884, p. 276), Hebrew was the school-tongue, the tongue of the learned, which the Rabbins spoke and the devout everywhere understood; yet a preacher who by choice addressed himself to the poor, would be much better understood if he spoke in Aramaic.

² *Meyer's Commentary on the New Testament*, etc. (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1884.)

the beginning of 1884, and the four Gospels and Paul's Epistles, from Romans to Ephesians, have already appeared. Each volume has been put into the hands of a competent scholar, who has revised the rendering, prefixed prefaces, and added here and there a note. The work has been well done. A somewhat different undertaking has given us a new edition of Adam Clarke's Commentary on the New Testament,¹ "condensed and supplemented from the best modern authorities." The result is a sort of semi-catena. Dr. Samuel T. Lowrie has the pre-eminence of having produced the single, important, original commentary of the year,²—a work of high value, quite in the spirit and manner of Von Hofmann. In reading it, one feels all the subtlety and *finesse* that he has been accustomed to think the peculiar property of the German author,—all of whose acuteness and originality and strength seem to have passed over to his old pupil across the seas. Those who dislike Von Hofmann, are not likely to admire this explanation of Hebrews; but students of the Epistle cannot afford to neglect it any more than New Testament students in general can afford to forget Von Hofmann himself. They may find much to disagree with in it,—provokingly much; but they will find much more that is admirably conceived and strongly said, and everywhere they will enjoy and learn and feel the hand of a master.

The periodical press furnishes us with two important papers on the Epistle to the Romans:—One is by the late Dr. Ezra Abbot, on "Recent Discussions of Romans ix. 5" (*Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* for 1883 [published in 1884], pp. 90–112), supplementing his paper on the same subject in the *Journal* for 1881, and criticizing somewhat severely Dr. Gifford's pamphlet: "A letter to Rev. Benj. Hall Kennedy, D.D., in reply to criticisms on the interpretation of Romans ix. 5, in *The Speaker's Commentary*." The other is an attempt to trace the train of thought in Romans ix.–xi. by Prof. E. P. Gould (same *Journal*, pp. 22–41). The difficult verse, 2 Peter i. 20, receives a full and very interesting treatment from Mr. Owen Street (*Biblio-*

¹ *The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, etc., by Adam Clarke, LL.D., etc. A new edition, condensed and supplemented from the best modern authorities, by Daniel Curry, LL.D. (New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1884. 2 vols. 8vo.)

² *An Explanation of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, by the Rev. Samuel Lowrie, D.D. (New York: Robert Carter & Bros. [1884], pp. 540, 8vo.)

thea Sacra, January, 1885, pp. 168-173), the hinge of which is the close paralleling of its ἐπιλυσι with the λύσι of John x. 35: "The one declares the Scripture *cannot* be broken, the other says it is a first truth that *it is not to be* loosed." We are on the confines of Biblical Theology in Mr. John Greene's spirited paper on "Life and Death in the New Testament" (*Baptist Quarterly Review*, Oct., 1884, vi. 24, pp. 411-431), the first part of which moves in the purely exegetical sphere. He arranges the words ψυχή [πνεῦμα], βίος, ἀναστροφή, ζωή, in this order,—the gradation being partly from inner to outward, partly from lower to higher. Ψυχή is the vital principle, or the bundle of experiences belonging to man as a conscious being. Βίος is the sum of the activities resulting from the ψυχή,—life as made up of phenomena. Ἀναστροφή introduces the moral aspect and relations. While ζωή is the life that is life indeed! The law of rank is so far observed that the lower do not intrude into the sphere of the higher; though ζωή sometimes, not frequently, invades the province of the lower words. "Death" has but one term to express it,—a negative term, the exact sense of which in each case is determined by the sense of "life" to which it is explicitly or implicitly opposed.

Finally, there are a few papers on points of New Testament grammar which are worth calling attention to. Dr. Henry A. Batty (*The Methodist Review*, March, 1885, pp. 215-233) discusses the Greek article in admirable style, arriving at the sound principle that its function is to particularize, while its absence leaves the qualitative idea of the word prominent. He illustrates chiefly from νόμος and ὁ νόμος, taking his stand in his treatment of the distinction by the side of Drs. Lightfoot, Vaughan, Goodwin, etc. The same writer has a paper in an earlier number of the same *Review* (April, 1884, pp. 337-348), attempting to prove the presence of the Gnomiæ aorist in the New Testament,—and successfully as we think, although we cannot admit all of the examples that he adduces. Prof. F. B. Denio attempts to reduce to rule (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1884, pp. 384-389), the translation into English of the Greek aorist as follows: (1) When the fact of occurrence is prominent and there is no adverbial limitation of time, use the preterite, *e.g.* Luke xix. 21. (2) Where mere occurrence is indicated, although there are adverbial limitations or contextual indications of time, use the preterite, *e.g.* John xvii. 1. (3) When the contextual reference is to present time and no

adverbial limitation dates the action specifically, usually use the perfect, *e.g.* Acts xii. 11. More unsuccessfully in our judgment, Prof. Wm. G. Ballantine (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct., 1884, pp. 787-799) investigates the usage of the aorist, predicative participle, in the New Testament; he is evidently, however, on the right track, and grammarians will do well to consult his paper.

Alleghany.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

SURVEY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION.—The criticism of the last fifty years has been for the New Testament a veritable Medea's caldron, out of which, to the surprise of its foes, and possibly also of some of its friends, it has emerged in the freshness of youth, with a new lease of life. Time was when reverence for the New Testament kept criticism silent, and one would as soon have "botanized upon a mother's grave" as have critically investigated the origin of those sacred writings. But in these last days, the supremacy of the New Testament has exposed it in a marked degree to "that fierce light which beats upon a throne." This light has not revealed any reasons for our discrediting the New Testament writings, but it has not been wholly without result. It has given us very much clearer ideas of the real nature and actual origin of these writings, and has compelled us to adopt new methods of defending them. The higher criticism, formidable in its equipment with all the destructive appliances of modern science, has taught us to replace our wooden walls with armoured engines of war, and to prove that science is available for defence as well as for attack. Many of the theories which a few years ago excited some trepidation are now as antiquated and harmless as a sailing frigate of the extinct type. This rapid superannuation of critical theories arises in great part from the lack of seriousness and reality, which has characterized much German criticism. The levity which aims at "such a display of ingenuity as makes people clap their hands and cry *Well done!* but does not seriously persuade them" has been scourged not too severely or contemptuously by Mr. Matthew Arnold, and is, as he says, "not much worth a wise man's ambitioning." A reaction in

favour of a sane and serious criticism has set in, and of this there is welcome evidence in the important and convincing volume by Dr. Salmon¹ of Dublin, a volume which makes one ashamed of having ever been influenced, even in the slightest degree, by the theory of Baur.

It were mere affectation and pedantry to speak of Dr. Salmon's volume in any other terms than those of unqualified praise. It was to be expected that one of the most accomplished and original of living scholars, after devoting the best years of his life to the studies compendiously known as "Introduction," would produce a book of importance. And no one who appreciates accuracy and vigour, and who can discriminate between what is fanciful and what is real, will be disappointed with the outcome of the reading and thinking of a life. This volume abounds in the results of original observation, and in fresh and forcible argument. Its conclusions, whether they be accepted or not, are supported by reasons so substantial, that the competence of those who in future handle these questions will be determined by the manner in which they deal with what is adduced by Dr. Salmon. It is in fact the first defence of the New Testament writings which is at once very strong and very full. It is bold, fully informed, and very convincing. Any one who makes himself familiar with the facts and arguments contained in this volume will have made solid attainment in the knowledge of the New Testament books, and of the present state of opinion regarding them. Actually delivered in great part to theological students, there is yet nothing of diffuseness in these lectures; and the circumstance that they were produced for the practical purpose of teaching, while it has certainly not admitted the slightest abatement in scientific accuracy, has allowed to the writer's wit an agreeable freedom, and imparted to the style unusual perspicacity and ease.

Although entitled "an Introduction," Dr. Salmon's work does not embrace all the topics commonly included under that title. As he himself says: "I do not enter on the criticism of the text, nor do I make any analysis of the contents of the books. My main purpose has been to discuss their date and authorship on purely historical grounds; and to examine, with sufficient completeness for a practical decision, the various theories on the subject

¹ *An Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament.* By George Salmon, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, University of Dublin. (London, John Murray, 1885.)

advanced by modern schools of criticism." This method has naturally its disadvantages; *e.g.* no account is given of the untested Epistles of Paul. Thanks to the audacity of modern criticism, this does not indeed greatly contract the range of Dr. Salmon's apologetic; still it is a disappointment to find that the four great Epistles are by their very eminence excluded from the scope of a writer who could have thrown on them the light of ascertained historical and linguistic knowledge. It will also be understood that Dr. Salmon's aim and method prevent him from giving some of the details which are found in books of the nature of Dr. Davidson's Introduction. But the task to which he has confined himself he has accomplished with a thoroughness which adverse critics cannot affect to despise and dare not overlook. Where all is good, it is perhaps needless to particularize; but special attention will, I think, be given to Dr. Salmon's admirable exposition of the origin of the Gospels, to his defence of the historicity of the Acts, and to his rehabilitation of 2 Peter in reply to the clever theory of Dr. Abbott. He would be very simple who should imagine that this or any other volume will end all controversy, and make it as impossible to doubt that the Epistles to Timothy are from the hand of Paul as that "Christmas Eve" is the work of Robert Browning. There is much to be done before such certainty is even approached. The genesis and growth of Gnosticism must be more accurately ascertained; the principles which govern the determination of authorship require to be more definitely settled; and perhaps as needful as any other requisite is the conviction under which Dr. Salmon writes, that "a man is just as bad a critic who rejects what is genuine as who accepts what is spurious." This volume then does not pronounce the final word; but one lays it down with the impression that, while no doubt learning and liberty are most precious boons, Baur and his disciples are actually further from objective truth than the blindest traditionalists, that for biassed manipulation of documents their treatment of the New Testament writings is unexampled, and that none but closet-critics could have propagated theories so flagrantly in violation of the ordinary actings of human nature.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.—No one who is interested in the study of the New Testament will omit to read two contributions to the recently issued volume of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* which bear the signature of Dr. Edwin Hatch. The article on Paul is a model of

compressed information and weighty thinking imparted in exact and lucid language. It was not to be expected that in an article of this kind much new light would be shed on a biography which has already attracted so constant and searching a scrutiny as that of Paul. The interest and value of Dr. Hatch's contribution arise rather from his apprehension of the points of vital importance, his maintenance of proportion in the treatment of these, and his judicious and delicate handling of much-debated matters. In every paragraph there occur phrases which quicken the imagination and suggest the wealth of information out of which the seemingly easy narrative is formed. Occasionally a difficulty in the story is over-leapt by the help of a not wholly intelligible expression of Luke or of Paul; but on the whole it is probably the last complaint a reader is likely to make, that difficulties have been minimized or evaded. It is more likely that some will complain that difficulties have been magnified; and that caution, not the most conspicuous of Dr. Hatch's qualifications as a critic, is somewhat unevenly applied in an article which at once declines to admit more than a "general probability" that Paul suffered martyrdom, and accepts it as a probable conjecture that he was affected with some nervous disorder allied to epilepsy. Scrupulous readers will also demur to his citing the name of Simon Peter in support of his extremely probable suggestion that Saul was called Paul "from the first"; as well as to his idea that Paul derived his notion of faith from the Old Testament—a supposition which is rendered wholly needless by Paul's own experience of conversion. But such scarcely perceptible blemishes are easily forgiven to an article which is fresh from the first word to the last, and in which the illuminating ray of cultured intelligence gives continuity and significance to a mass of details.

The latter half of the article is devoted to an exposition of the theology of Paul. Necessarily brief, this summary is yet based on so complete and exact a comparison of passages, and is so studiously careful in statement, so full of insight, and so alive with thought, that it cannot fail to expand to ampler knowledge in the reader's mind. Confidence in the writer is inspired at the outset by his eminently suggestive statement of the difficulties attaching to any attempt to systematize the ideas of Paul; and this confidence is upheld by the accuracy, candour, and fairness which characterize his own attempt. Naturally, where ideas of so much importance

and so much questioned are touched upon, disappointment will be felt that the limits and nature of the article prevented the writer from saying more. On p. 427 occur these significant sentences: "To most of the philosophical questions which have since been raised in connexion with [the soteriology of Paul] he neither gives nor implies an answer. It is possible that many of these questions did not even suggest themselves to him. The chief of all of them, that of the necessity of sacrifice, was probably axiomatic to a Jewish mind, and its place in Paul's system must be accepted, with all the difficulties which such an acceptance involves." That is a most reasonable and fair statement; and yet it leaves the reader desirating a clearer exhibition of the process of thought by which Paul was led to transfer, apparently, the sacrificial idea entire to the death of Christ. Very possibly nothing more can be said than that the idea of sacrifice was axiomatic to the Jewish mind; but did not the revolution through which Paul's mind passed dismiss from it other ideas which to all appearance were as axiomatic to the Jew? and is it not certain that Paul retained the sacrificial idea because he found for it its realization in the death of Christ, and could give to his own mind an intelligible account of its retention? At the same time, it is by no means easy to say what that intelligible account was. In fact, it is one of the hardest problems in Biblical theology to trace the history of the transference of the complete sacrificial idea to the death of Christ, to show the grounds of this transference in the actual events preceding and accompanying the crucifixion, and in His relations to His disciples; and to distinguish between the symbolic and the real in the arrangements and language of sacrifice. In the most peculiarly Jewish, and possibly the earliest, of the Epistles, that of James, there is no mention of sacrifice. In the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, though distinctly Jewish, it is absent. And although in the writings of Peter it is prominent, yet so far as can be gathered from the records of his earliest preaching, it was to Jesus as Prince rather than as sacrifice that he pointed men.

Dr. Hatch's critical point of view was sufficiently indicated in the *Bampton Lectures*. In those learned and ingenious discussions he appeared as an open-minded scholar, with much sympathy for critical difficulties and hesitations, and considerable willingness to abide in an attitude of philosophical suspense. This accommodation of his own opinions to the scruples of less robust scholars

betrays him at times into apparent inconsistency; while at other times it imparts an Ishmaelitish double-edgedness to his deliverances, which will be relished neither by liberals nor by conservatives. Here is an example. Of the Book of Acts he says: "What colouring of a later time, derived from later controversies, has been spread over the original outline of the history cannot now be told. While on the one hand the difficulties of the narrative as it stands cannot be overlooked, yet on the other hand no faithful historian will undertake, in the absence of all collateral evidence, the task of discriminating that which belongs to a contemporary testimony, and that which belongs to a subsequent recension." Many of the trifling objections to the historicity of the Acts, which have flattered the self-complacency of ingenious critics, Dr. Hatch's robust sense shakes off, "as dewdrops from a lion's mane"; but at times he exhibits an altogether extravagant generosity to fanciful criticism, as in speaking of 1 Thessalonians as "perhaps not beyond dispute."

Those who disliked the conclusions at which Dr. Hatch arrived in his *Bampton Lectures* will no doubt declare that his rejection of the *Pastoral Epistles* was a foregone conclusion; and they may think that their anticipations are verified in the article just published. It will be said that his theory of the organization of the early Church compelled him to set aside these Epistles and refuse to accept their evidence regarding the Apostolic Church. And certainly Dr. Hatch's theory of the growth of ecclesiastical organization will not be generally accepted, until he is able to show that its acceptance is not incompatible with the belief that these are the genuine Epistles of Paul. But regarding their genuineness there is sufficient room for difference of opinion to make the charge of bias unreasonable.

Similar in subject to the articles of Dr. Hatch, but differing widely in method and in results, are the *Hibbert Lectures*, of Prof. Pfleiderer.¹ The substance of these Lectures has already been given to the public in the author's well-known and classical work on Paulinism. But the present volume is far from being a dead abridgment or stiff compilation from his larger work. On the contrary, it is written with all the freshness and force of an original conception; and not only are some positions—

¹ *Lectures on the Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity.* By Otto Pfleiderer, D.D. (London: Williams & Norgate, 1885.)

possibly out of deference to, or at least with the consciousness of, an English audience—more guardedly defined, but the lecture of greatest permanent value, that on the theology of Paul, introduces some novel and important suggestions not to be found in the former work. And while nothing could surpass the penetration, research, and utility, especially of the first half, of the larger book, these Lectures, while presenting a clear and comprehensive view of the place and influence of Paulinism in the early Church, possess the additional merit of forming a volume of most inviting reading. In fact, if that fiasco of modern criticism, the Tübingen construction of apostolic and sub-apostolic times, is still to be propagated, it could not be more lucidly nor more temperately and persuasively presented than it is in these Lectures. The tone of the lecturer is perfect. It is the tone of the scholar, too much absorbed in his theme to have any mind for personalities, and saved from all that is trivial by his clear apprehension of the central and guiding idea. From beginning to end not one abusive or contemptuous word is cast at any opposing theory. And however firmly the reader may dissent from Pfeiderer's conception of the relation of Paul to the original Apostles, and of the results of that relation in the post-apostolic Church, he cannot fail to profit by the stimulating suggestiveness of his exposition of the development of Paulinism. For while the Tübingen sense of proportion and perspective in history is truly Chinese, individual events and single momenta of history are depicted with masterly and most instructive insight. The weakness and strength of the Tübingen school are indeed one; it has seized a single factor of primitive history with such intensity of concentration, that it has eyes for no other factor at all. The writers of that school have brought to the defence of their position so vast a wealth of learning, that their works are storehouses of information; and one is continually tempted to adapt the line of Horace, and say of them, "The gods have given them riches, but not the art of using them."

In the present volume Prof. Pfeiderer makes one or two admissions of considerable importance. He admits that the distinction between the "false brethren" and the elder Apostles must not be overlooked; and also that we have *no definite information* regarding the part taken by the original Apostles in the persistent opposition of Paul, initiated by the Judaizing party. It is also satisfactory

to find the following statement regarding the reconciliation of the two accounts of the Council of Jerusalem: "I am of opinion that this question has not in reality the great importance which is often attached to it; for whether the removal of this special difference is thought to be possible or not, appears to me to be of quite secondary moment in view of the unquestionable fact, that, with regard to the real meaning and object of the Apostles' agreement, the accounts of Paul and of the Acts conduct to essentially unanimous results." In dealing with the Apocalypse, as with the other New Testament writings, Pfeiderer follows the traditions, if not the necessities, of the Tübingen school. And nowhere does the power of these traditions more distinctly appear than in the compulsion they put upon a man of his independence and discernment to find an anti-Pauline bias in the description of the New Jerusalem, which "had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb"; a description surely in perfect accordance with Paul's idea of the true Israel, and which might indeed have well been written by the very hand that wrote, "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed." It is also disappointing to find that in common with his school he traces an anti-Pauline bias in the expression (Rev. ii. 2), "them which say they are apostles, and are not," apparently oblivious that Paul himself has occasion to speak of "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ." But, carried as Pfeiderer is by the traditions of his school, he does not blind himself to the remarkable agreement in doctrine, and especially in Christology, between the Apocalypse and the Pauline writings. To account at once for the Pauline theology and for the anti-Pauline spirit of the book, he invents the ingenious theory that the Apocalypse proceeded from a man who at one time of his life had come much in contact with Paul and felt his influence, though hostile to him, probably from a leader of that party of which Paul complains in his Epistle to the Philippians, that they preached Christ "of envy."

There are also evidences throughout the volume that even to a man of genius it is an impossible task to construct a thoroughly consistent history of sub-apostolic times on the hypothesis of Baur. To cite but one example: the Epistle to the Ephesians is, according to Pfeiderer, a significant monument of the desire for reconciliation between the two great sections of the Church which

existed in the second century; yet in the Epistle of Clement, which he admits to lie within the first century, he sees Paulinism already becoming Catholicism. But the blemishes in the book are the unavoidable weaknesses of the theory: the lucidity, the thoroughness, the originality, the insight are Prof. Pfleiderer's.

Such volumes as Dr. Fraser's *Metaphors in the Gospels*,¹ help to sustain expository preaching at a high level. The accuracy of its expository matter is commendable, and the applications of our Lord's teaching to modern life are always sensible and in good taste, and sometimes incisive.

Those who interest themselves in forms of Church government and worship, in schemes of alliance and union, in creeds and other ecclesiastical matters, will do well to ponder the seasonable, well-considered, eminently sensible, and fairly liberal volume² of Dr. Dykes, of Ayr.

MARCUS DOPS.

BREVIA.

Oltramare on Romans.—It will be readily admitted that, among many excellent popular commentaries which have placed the results of modern research within reach of the mass of English readers, there have been during the last ten years very few works embodying a real advance in New Testament scholarship. To one such work I wish now to call attention.

This Commentary on Romans is by Dr. Oltramare, Professor of Theology in the University of Geneva, in two volumes similar in size and shape to, but rather larger than, those of his countryman Dr. Godet, and is dated November 1st, 1881. So long ago as 1843 Dr. Oltramare published a commentary on Rom. i.-v. The present work is the result of a lifelong devotion to this great Epistle.

The work lately published is marked by wide knowledge of the literature of the subject, by thorough grammatical accuracy, delicate tact, and patient effort to trace the exact thought of the

¹ *Metaphors in the Gospels*. By Donald Fraser, D.D. (London: James Nisbet & Co., 1885.)

² *The Christian Church in Relation to Human Experience*. By Thomas Dykes, D.D. (Glasgow: James Maclehose & Sons, 1885.)

Apostle. Not quite equal in grammar and exegesis to Fritzsche and Meyer, Dr. Oltramare surpasses Godet in these points, and surpasses all these writers in apposite illustrations of St. Paul's phraseology and in the thoroughness with which he discusses points of doctrinal interest. On the other hand, in matters of doctrine, both Meyer and Godet seem to me to be in the main in much closer accord than he with the sentiment of St. Paul.

While readily admitting that the term *Son of God* notes a unique relation, Dr. Oltramare's exposition of this relation seems to me to fall far below the thought of St. Paul. And, recoiling from current misrepresentations of man's redemption as a matter of bargain and payment, he fails, I think, to trace the full relation between our sin and Christ's death. Throughout chap. viii. he understands *the Spirit of God* to be not "a Person distinct from God," but "the spirit which belongs to God or which animates Him, . . . this complex of thoughts, of sentiments, of desires, which are His and which animate Him"—an exposition quite insufficient to explain the Apostle's language.

It is, however, right to say that even where most defective, Dr. Oltramare's work is always worthy of careful study. His positive statements seem to me in the main correct, failing only that they do not go far enough. And even his objections to current beliefs are never without reason; although sometimes unduly influenced by common perversions of them, he rejects doctrines which I hold to be true and precious. Taken as a whole, to the thoughtful student who will weigh it well and hear another side, this is one of the most profitable books I know.

On Rom. v. 1 Dr. Oltramare rejects, as do Meyer and Godet, in spite of the overwhelming documentary evidence which compelled the revisers to accept it without even a marginal note, the reading *let us have peace*, because unable to accept any exposition of it yet offered. This felt difficulty I may claim, until better instructed, as a justification of the solution attempted in *THE EXPOSITOR*, Second Series, vol. i. p. 387, and in my own commentary; viz. *Let us then, justified by faith, have peace with God*. Dr. Oltramare understands chap. vii. 14-25 to describe St. Paul's state before conversion, and chap. ix. 5 to be a doxology to God the Father.

It is not too much to say that the work described above deserves the careful study of all who wish to understand the masterpiece of the great Apostle.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

Heaping Coals of Fire on the Head (Rom. xii. 20).—The expositions commonly given of this passage are not altogether clear and satisfactory, the reason being seemingly that sufficient attention has not been paid to the usage and idiom of metaphorical language. Metaphors may be cast in the form of proverbial sentences. And this class of metaphor is the more difficult, because there may be no connexion or natural resemblance between the comparison and the thing compared; because the idea intended and implied is to be sought for, not in the terms, but the sum of them, not in the process described, but in the effect produced.

Take for example Hezekiah's message to Isaiah (2 Kings xix. 3). "*The children are come to the birth, and there is not strength to bring forth.*" The one idea expressed is absolute weakness, a time of extremity.

This proverbial or gnomic form of metaphorical illustration abounds in the older Greek poets. Thus in Æschylus (*Eumen.* 694), Minerva, after bespeaking reverence for the Areopagus, utters this warning against innovation of its laws: "If you pollute bright water with foul streams and mud, you will find nought to drink." Again in the same poet (*Agam.* 322) the tumult of a captured city and the cries of victim and vanquished have this abrupt illustration: "If you pour vinegar and oil into the same vessel, you will say that they are at variance, and not friends."

It is plain at once that in each of these two proverb-like figures one main idea only is contained, and that one which is not affected by nor connected with the particular terms used. The poet does not parallel water with law nor mud with innovation; the one thing intended is deterioration of good. So it is with the "oil and vinegar;" neither word illustrates or represents victors or vanquished, the one point made is, the conflict of opposites. And a rule is clearly discoverable for interpreting such metaphorical sentences.

Look now at the passage from the Romans. "*In so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head.*"

The words, taken literally, suggest a notion of cruel and barbarous revenge. But in explaining them we are to put aside the actual words, as much as in the above similes from Æschylus; we have simply to search for the main idea involved in the suppressed comparison. That one idea is "overcoming evil with

good." It has been generally agreed that the metaphor is taken from metallurgy, to which reference is constantly made in the Bible; the "melting fire" of the furnace would have been a familiar sight to any Israelite, and suggest a natural comparison to him. Still, while taking this as the basis for exposition, we are to think not of the process, but of the result effected, not of the quickening the fire, but the fusing of the metal beneath; and so, figuratively, of the melting and softening harsh and angry feeling. If we expand the condensed phrase into a comparison, the meaning will be clear at once: "*By charity and kindness thou shalt soften down his enmity, as surely as heaping coals on the fire fuses the metal in the crucible.*"

It will follow, that the idea of drawing down wrath or adding to Divine vengeance (an idea reconcilable neither with perfect charity nor with faith in Divine compassion), or again of kindling remorse in the offender, is noway required by the figurative phraseology of the verse, and is rather opposed to its idiomatic construction.

J. E. YONGE.

Miss Rossetti's "Time Flies."¹ This unpretending little book has more life in it than many whose praises have been loudly sounded. To appreciate Miss Rossetti's quaint and subtle prose requires a (very pleasant) process of education. But every true lover of English poetry will find in this book some of the author's most exquisite work—nothing perhaps so memorable as the transcendent "Passing Away,"—but many brief lyrics almost unmatched for their tender yet austere beauty. Those who see in Miss Rossetti, not only the greatest of the distinctively Christian singers of England, but also one of the most wise and sympathetic teachers of catholic Christianity, will find in this book much to be closely and humbly studied. Again we recognise her intense devotion to the Passion of our Lord; the sense of the peril of the soul, the torturing sting of sin, the exceeding breadth of the commandment, the vanity of all things here. "*Pass the time of your sojourning here in fear,*" expresses much but by no means all of her teaching. One is reminded of the passage where Bunyan perhaps reaches his highest point—that most loving delineation of Mr. Fearing, who was however very valiant in Vanity Fair, being no

¹ *Time Flies: a Reading Diary.* By Christina G. Rossetti. London, S.P.C.K.

coward: "You must understand his fear was not about such things as these; his fear was about his acceptance at last." More prominent perhaps than ever is the thought of Death, which colours every page. Death, it was well said by William Caldwell Roscoe, is necessary to English tragedy, though only incidental to Greek, because the end in English tragedy is determinately evolved, and Death gives the completest ending. In Miss Rossetti's poetry, Death is praised and welcomed, not only as rounding the course of fate, as the full completion of the dispensations of life. Death makes the soul safe, it is the gate of heaven, it brings to the sufficing vision of Christ, it restores to us, in the company of saints and angels, "our own beyond the salt sea wall." Thus, while she recognises the joys of life, and can present them in a light both warm and clear, Death becomes more and more in her pages the one eastern window, the one door of hope.

EDITOR.

THE RESTORATION OF ORDER IN A CHURCH THREATENED WITH DISSOLUTION.

FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

III.

THIS letter, which is called the first, but which was, in reality, the second, begins like all the other Epistles (except that to the Galatians), with a greeting and thanksgiving. These are contained in the first nine verses. As usual, this introduction, while taking in part the form habitual with Paul, has certain special features corresponding to the state of the Church. *Holiness*, as the seal of all true Christians, the *oneness* of the Church, based upon a common adoration of the name of Christ, are features on which Paul dwells, not without intention, in the salutation (chap. i. 1-3). And the marked omission in his thanksgiving of any reference to the moral fruits of the Gospel, while he speaks of the gifts of utterance and of knowledge, with which the Church was enriched, is very significant. This will be made the more striking by a comparison with the corresponding passages in the Epistles to the Thessalonians (1 Thess. i. 3; 2 Thess. i. 3, 4).

As we have said, the Apostle had to treat in this Epistle nine topics altogether heterogeneous. How has he managed to blend such a variety of subjects into anything like harmony? He refers first to the dissensions which had sprung up in the Church; that is to say, if we may use the expression, he begins with the *ecclesiastical question*. A little reflection will show how wise he was in doing so. It was

necessary that at the very outset he should vindicate his position in relation to the entire Church before commencing the directions which he had to give on the various matters which were to follow. He deals with this very delicate personal matter in the first four chapters. He explains first of all how he is led to speak of it. If he mentions the household of Chloe as his informers, it is probably that the Corinthians may not suppose that the news was brought by the three messengers of the Church who are with him at the time. After describing the internal dissensions in the Church, and pointing out how utterly inconsistent they are with the sole sovereignty of Christ (chap. i. 12-16), he strikes at the root of the evil by showing that it arises out of a false conception of the Gospel. The Corinthians have been thinking of the Gospel as wisdom, a system adapted to satisfy the intellect, while it is in truth *salvation*, a Divine power to rescue man from perdition (chap. i. 18). No doubt God had appealed first to man's reason, revealing Himself to it in a way full of wisdom, in the works of creation. But man, not having understood this revelation under the form of wisdom, God has humbled his proud reason by dispensing with it, and now offers him salvation by a method which looks like folly, even by the cross of Christ. Hence not many wise and mighty men joined the ranks of the believers at Corinth. And how little had he, Paul, the preacher of the Cross, attempted to have recourse to excellency of speech or of wisdom in declaring his message (i. 18; ii. 4, 5)! Not that there is not Divine and glorious wisdom contained in the Gospel. The Apostle well knows how to display this to the eyes of those whose ripened Christianity fits them to receive it (chap. ii. 6). But this sublime wisdom, which God imparts by His Spirit to His servants, that they may declare it in inspired words to those who are spiritually-minded, the Corinthians are not in a fit state as yet to receive. There-

fore the Apostle has kept them to the elements of the Gospel, like children who must be fed with milk (chap. iii. 1-4).

From the true nature of the Gospel Paul deduces that of the Christian ministry. A preacher of the Gospel, such as himself or Apollos, is not a wise man, the head of a school; he is simply the servant of Christ, the one Lord (v. 5). Hence it is absurd to set up any rivalry among the servants of God, as though they were not all engaged in the same work. For himself, he is well content to have carried out at Corinth the commission given to him, namely, to lay the foundation stone of the Church, which is Christ Jesus, leaving it to others to build upon it, which is a more difficult and delicate task. For it is possible for men to build with bad materials, or even to destroy while they think they are building up; and thus, not only their work, but they themselves may be in danger of being burnt up. The Church does not belong to its teachers; the teachers belong to the Church, and the Church belongs to Christ alone, as He to God (chap. iii. 6-23).

St. Paul is not therefore at all troubled at the things said about him in Corinth. God, the Searcher of all hearts, will try his work, as well as the work of his opponents and critics (chap. iv. 5). St. Paul explains all this as though he were speaking solely of himself and Apollos, because he would have the Corinthians learn the general lesson, not to run wild after one teacher, to the disparagement of another. They have given place to spiritual pride. They seem to be sailing on a flood-tide of glory, while the Apostles, the founders of their Church, are left behind and subjected to all the sufferings and reproaches of the present time. The contrast thus sharply drawn might well make the Corinthians blush for their folly. Paul adds that Timothy is about to come to them as his messenger. He will seek to set them again in the right way. Then Paul himself will come, if the Lord will; and he asks how he will find them

—puffed up with vain words, or still witnessing to the living power of the Gospel? (chap. iv. 6-21.)

The argument against human wisdom, which forms the basis and the substance of this first part of the Epistle, has often been supposed to apply to Apollos and his method of preaching. This is, we think, a grave mistake. Apollos, far from being a mere philosopher, was a powerful interpreter of the word of God (Acts xviii. 25-28), and St. Paul associates him closely with himself in several passages (chap. iii. 5, 6; iv. 6). How then could it be to him that Paul applies such a word as this, "God hath made foolish the wisdom of the world"? It is quite clear moreover, from chapter xvi. 12, that Apollos was even more indignant than Paul himself at the conduct of the Corinthians with regard to him.

From the ecclesiastical question, treated in the first part of the Epistle, the Apostle passes to a subject of somewhat kindred nature—a question of discipline which had arisen out of a case of scandalous impurity. It has often been said that the Apostle is here dealing with the vice of impurity itself. This is not so. He does not touch on this subject till chapter vi. Previously to that, he is speaking of the course of conduct the Church should pursue when any scandals arise in her midst. It is only an accident that in this instance the cause of offence is an act of impurity. There has been a case of fornication in the Church, and such fornication as was not even among the Gentiles. In face of so black a deed how does this Church, so proud of her gifts of utterance and of knowledge, comport herself? She seems to have passed it indifferently by. But Paul at a distance hears of the crime, and "being absent in body, but present in spirit, judges him that had wrought this thing." Rebuking the neglect of the Church, he charges her that, "being gathered together," with his spirit and the power of the Lord Jesus, such a one be delivered "unto Satan for the

destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus."

After this terrible denunciation, the Apostle asks what can be the cause of this effeminacy and laxity of morals pervading the Church at Corinth. He is sure that there must be some old leaven of malice and wickedness deadening their spiritual life. He suggests that it is spiritual pride. Yet when once Christ the paschal Lamb has been sacrificed for us, the life of His Church should be one continual paschal feast, in which no leaven should be found. He does not indeed wish to set up a wall of outward separation between the faithful and sinners in general; for then, as they themselves had objected, they must needs go out of the world. No; it is those who are called Christian brethren, and yet fraternise with sin, against whom he would warn them. The Church is bound to show, by refusing to keep company with such, that it does not recognise this connivance of professing Christians with sin. The Church must judge her members, as Israel of old judged offenders against the law of God, stoning them to death. The Apostle points out in this chapter two ways in which this judgment may be passed. First, there may be a collective appeal to God, that He would Himself visit the guilty (chap. v. 2). Second, the breaking off all intercourse of the faithful with the offender. I see nothing like a formal excommunication in either of these proposed measures, nor indeed throughout the chapter. The act by which the Apostle delivers the offender to Satan is not excommunication. Excommunication is not destroying the body with the view of saving the soul. The question of discipline treated in chapter v. forms the link between the ecclesiastical question (chap. i.-iv.) and the questions of morality discussed in the succeeding chapters (vi.-x.). These are four: going to law, impurity, marriage, and the eating of meats offered to idols.

From the matter of discipline the Apostle passes to the question of Christians going to law with one another before the Gentile tribunals. He would shame the Corinthians for so forgetting the obligations of Christian honour. Is it so, he says, that you, who are to judge the world and the angels, you who pride yourselves on your wisdom, cannot find one wise man among you who shall be able to decide a petty question of *meum* and *tuum* between brethren? Should they not blush at having any such disputations among themselves? Nay; are they not defrauding one another, forgetting that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God? (chap. vi. 1-11.)

But there are even graver evils among them. They have misconstrued and taken up as a general maxim words which the Apostle had used in reference to one particular thing. "All things are lawful for me," they say. Yes; anything is lawful, but for a Christian man to alienate his liberty, and bring his soul into bondage to sin. But this is what the Corinthians are doing by indulging in impurity of life, as though that were as legitimate as eating and drinking. They have forgotten that the body of the believer is to be a temple of the Holy Ghost, the very Spirit of Christ dwelling in him, so that he is not his own but Christ's; and that to desecrate this temple is to be guilty of the most deadly sin (chap. vi. 6-20).

From this subject the Apostle passes to one still more delicate and closely connected with it. This question, the advisability of celibacy or marriage, had been submitted to him by the Corinthians themselves in a letter to which he refers (chap. vii. 1). Perhaps a reaction from the laxity of morals at Corinth had led some of the new converts to regard marriage as a thing impure in itself. They probably confirmed themselves in this opinion by the example of Paul and of Christ Himself. The Apostle takes up first the question of the formation of the conjugal tie. He recog

nises the moral beauty of the position of the man who holds himself free from any such bonds and retains his complete independence; but he admits that such a condition is not common, and is only safe for those who are specially called to it of God (chap. vii. 1-9). He next examines the questions which may arise among married people, in relation to this subject. When some difference has arisen between a Christian husband and wife, or when one is converted and not the other, so that a Christian wife perhaps finds herself joined to a pagan husband, what course should be taken? In the first case, the Apostle sanctions their separation, but forbids the Christian husband's marrying again. In the second case, he advises the Christian husband or wife not to break the conjugal tie, if the other is willing to maintain it, for the very willingness to do so implies a measure of acquiescence in the principle of Christian holy living, adopted by the new convert. As a general rule, the Apostle recommends Christians not to be impatient to change the outward circumstances in which they have been called, but to abide in their calling, even if it be that of slavery: "for he that was called in the Lord, being a bondservant, is the Lord's freeman; and he that was called, being free, is Christ's bondservant." Nevertheless, if opportunity offer for the slave to regain his freedom, he is justified in doing so (chap. vii. 10-24).

The third question touched on by the Apostle is that of the marriage of *young Christian girls*, a question which presented special difficulties, because, according to ancient custom, it was the father who decided absolutely the fate of his children, particularly that of his daughters. In Paul's view there were two arguments in favour of celibacy as preferable for young Christian girls. In the first place, there were the ever-increasing difficulties of the position, which render the life of the mother of a family more and more trying; and next, the greater freedom with which

a young girl can devote herself exclusively to the Lord's service, without having to consult in everything the will of the husband to whom she has surrendered her freedom. The Apostle extends the application of these principles to widows (chap. vii. 25-40). It is evident that he does not look upon celibacy as in itself a holier state than matrimony; he only points out that it offers more freedom and facility for Christian service. The Apostle has been often reproached for the manner in which he has treated this subject; but it would have been scarcely possible surely to reply with more circumspection and completeness to the difficult questions placed before him.

The Apostle does not fail to recognise the element of Christian liberty which enters into this subject, and this forms the link between the foregoing passage and that which follows. It seems probable that the next question, that of the lawfulness of using meats that had been offered in sacrifice to idols, may also have been laid before the Apostle in the letter from the Church. Portions of this meat were either eaten at sacred feasts or offered for sale in the market. Many Christians at Corinth felt some scruple in using such food. It seemed to them dangerous thus to come in contact with the impure spirit of idolatry. Others, on the other hand, who held broader views, were not afraid either to eat such viands, or even to partake of them at the banquets which their relations and friends held in the temple of the idol to whom the sacrifice had been offered. The Apostle takes up this question in Chapters viii.-x. He looks at them first simply from the standpoint of Christian charity, urging those who are stronger and more enlightened to remember that they should not by the imprudent use of their liberty bring sin upon the conscience of the more scrupulous (chap. viii.). Then he quotes his own example, to show the strong how they ought willingly to submit to privations for love of their brethren. He who as an apostle

might have looked to the Churches which he had founded to support him, works for his livelihood with his own hands, that the Gospel may make freer way. On the same principle, while holding himself free from all legal observances, he yet submits to them when he can hope by this means to save one soul (chap. ix. 1-23). And in thus acting, he does not labour merely for the good of his brethren, but also for his own, which he would certainly compromise if he sought only to please himself. He reminds the Corinthians of what happened to the Israelites in the desert, when they gave the reins to their lusts and murmured at the privations which God designed for their discipline. In like manner will self-indulgence be fatal to the Christian life (chap. ix. 23-x. 13). This brings the Apostle to the point about which the Corinthian Christians were most concerned, the question of the lawfulness of taking part in heathen banquets. The time has come when this difficult question must be decided, and Paul draws the line with a very firm hand. The Christian who sits at the communion table places himself by that act under the influence of Christ, who presides unseen over the sacred feast. The Israelite who eats the meat of the sacrifice offered in the temple, places himself thus under the influence of the altar and of the worship of Jehovah. In like manner, he who sits at the idol feasts places himself under the influence of the spirit of the demons, which is the spirit of idolatry. Let the Corinthians themselves judge whether they can partake, side by side, of the table of the Lord and the table of demons (chap. x. 14-21). The Apostle concludes this discussion of principles with certain practical rules, addressed specially to the strong, as to the use of meats sacrificed to idols, winding up with this supreme law: "Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God" (chap. x. 23-32).

The Apostle has now done with the moral questions.

strictly so called, which had been brought before him, both those which he could decide positively—such as the going to law, and living in impurity; and those which must be referred ultimately to Christian liberty—such as marriage and the eating of meats offered to idols.

He now passes to an altogether different order of subjects; namely, those which relate to worship, and what might be called liturgical questions (chaps. xi.-xiv.). Of these he takes up three: the demeanour of women in the assemblies of the Church; the removal of abuses in the celebration of the Lord's Supper; the use of the gifts of the Spirit.

The Apostle begins with the one in which Christian liberty has largest scope. Woman, according to ancient usage, not only in the East, but also in Greece, was rarely seen abroad, and never under any circumstances played any public part. Even in the theatres, the women's parts were taken by men. Nevertheless it appears that in the Church of Corinth, led away by a false idea of freedom, they had begun both to pray and prophesy in the assemblies, no doubt on the plea that they were moved to do so by an irresistible impulse of the indwelling Spirit. The Apostle does not wish to put a violent stop to this spiritual movement; but he endeavours to guard against its possible ill consequences, by requiring the woman who speaks to observe the utmost modesty of dress and demeanour. If she wishes to pray or prophesy in public, she must do so with veiled head, in token of her position of dependence with regard to her husband. This dependent position is a step in the Divine order which regulates the relation of the man to Christ, and of Christ Himself to God. The angels who watch over the worship of the Church, would be offended by any demeanour on the part of woman inconsistent with a relation allied to other relations so high and holy. Woman's physical organization is itself a testimony to the modesty and delicacy which should be

the law of her life, for the long hair with which God has endowed her is like a natural veil, indicating the Divine will with regard to her (xi. 1-16).

In view of these arguments, it is impossible to say that the Apostle's prohibition is based upon the customs of the day and place, and is no longer valid. The reasons which he assigns,—the relation of Christ to God, the presence of the angels in worshipping assemblies, and the long hair given to women,—are facts which remain the same in all ages and in all places.

There were other and graver irregularities in the Corinthian Church. Adhering to the manner of the first institution of the Lord's supper, it was the custom of the early Church to celebrate it at the conclusion of a brotherly meal. The viands for this banquet were provided by the communicants themselves. The bond of true brotherliness would have required that all these viands should be placed on the table and eaten in common. But instead of this, it became the practice at Corinth for each guest selfishly to appropriate and eat that which he had sent, so that the rich would allow the poor sitting beside them to want, while they themselves had enough and to spare; and such selfish and revolting conduct preluded the observance of the Lord's supper. The Apostle tries to make the Corinthians ashamed of their conduct, by reminding them of the institution of the supper. It was not a feast intended to gratify the appetite, but a religious rite instituted by Christ to call up the most sacred of memories, and only to be observed in deep seriousness of mind. The violation of this rule would bring the condemnation of God upon them, as was already shown by the sickness which was ravaging their Church (chap. xi. 17-34).

By far the most difficult question yet remained; the right use of *spiritual gifts*. These supernatural powers, conferred by the influence of the Spirit, were based no

doubt upon the natural aptitudes of individuals. They were personal talents, of which the Spirit made use in the regeneration of the persons themselves, and which became subsequently its instruments for the propagation of the spiritual life. The Apostle enumerates as many as nine of these gifts in chapter xii. But the two principal ones, those which seem to have excited a sort of rivalry at Corinth, were the *speaking with tongues* and *prophecy*. The Apostle describes the former as a state of ecstasy in which the soul was filled with all the sweetness of the joys of salvation, and expressed this ineffable happiness by words unintelligible to those who heard them, and of which even those who uttered them had no cognisance. Yet it might happen that one of the hearers might be enabled to follow, and to give the interpretation ; or even the speaker himself, when the state of ecstasy had passed, might be able to give an account of his or her experience. It is evident that this form of the gift of tongues differed materially from that on the day of Pentecost, for at Jerusalem no interpretation was needed. The language of the disciples was immediately understood by the hearers. Those who had the gift of prophecy exercised it in speech which could be at once followed by all. While, as the Apostle said, the one who spoke with tongues spoke to God, the prophet spoke to men. Filled with a sudden revelation, relating either to the requirements of the time, or to some phase of the future of the Church, he delivered his message in powerful words, designed to strengthen and encourage the assembly. The gift of tongues, from its altogether miraculous character, had strangely enlisted the sympathy of the Church. There was a third gift, which assumed a more unpretending form than either of the other two—the gift of teaching. The province of this gift was to unfold in a quiet, clear, and consecutive manner the truths of the faith. It is easy to imagine the sort of rivalry set up among these gifts. And

it was this which called for the interference of the Apostle, and has secured to us the possession of the three wonderful chapters (xii.-xiv.) in this Epistle, in which he deals with this difficult question.

The Apostle begins by defining the sphere of the Holy Spirit's operation, and he does this by describing the essential character of the work wrought by this Divine agent; namely, to glorify Christ. He then points out the unity and diversity of the manifestations of this principle, and in this respect compares this spiritual phenomenon to the organization of the human body, the life of which is *one*, while the members are many. There is no room therefore for any exaltation of the more brilliant above the humbler gifts, nor for despising these, which are really the most indispensable. Each must desire just those gifts by which he can best serve his brethren (chap. xii.).

This is the course enjoined by the supreme law of love, that virtue without which all other gifts are void, and which, with faith and hope, will outlive the gifts of prophecy and teaching. Love is even greater than its two companions faith and hope, since through it alone are we made perfectly one with God (chap. xiii.). In this pæan to Love, the Apostle places the exercise of all the gifts under the control of this sublime principle. And now, from this standpoint, he discusses the relative value of the special spiritual gifts—speaking with tongues, and prophecy. The superiority of the latter is now at once obvious. In conclusion, he gives some wise practical rules, by which he seeks to stem that torrent of miraculous gifts, which, swollen by the pride and vanity of the Church of Corinth, threatened to desolate instead of fertilizing it. He adds one word with regard to the function of teaching as regards women, condemning it absolutely, and saying it is shameful for a woman to speak in the church (chap. xiv.).

One more subject—the most important of all—remains

to be treated, and this the Apostle reserved for the close of his letter. It is a question of doctrine—the *resurrection of the body*. This is closely connected with the question whether Christ Himself rose again from the dead; for salvation can only be realized by us as it was wrought out by Him. Now it is a fact, attested by the Apostles and by Paul himself, that Christ had appeared to them in bodily form, and that He was actually raised from the dead. If this was not a fact, the Apostles are false witnesses: nay, more, it follows that the salvation of mankind was not wrought out by Christ; for if He who in His dying bore our condemnation was not delivered by resurrection from the dead, then our condemnation remains, and the Christian, in sacrificing all for the life to come, is deluded by a false hope. This is the abyss of despair, into which we are plunged if Christ is not risen. But laying afresh this foundation broad and strong (which he had for the moment hypothetically denied) the Apostle sees rising upon it the whole glorious edifice of Christian hope: the resurrection of believers on the coming again of Christ; the ultimate destruction of death by the universal resurrection, after Christ shall have overthrown, in His millenarian reign, all His enemies; and then the final act, when, the mediatorial reign being ended, Christ shall deliver up the kingdom to His Father, that God may be all in all to the sanctified believers.

Of what avail, he asks again, is it to be baptized for the dead, if the dead are not raised at all? There is still much difference of opinion as to the meaning of this expression. To me it seems that the words which follow the verse point to the conclusion that the expression is a figurative one, meant to describe the martyr's sanguinary death. He who goes through this baptism of blood in order to join a glorified Church which has no existence, must be a fool. In that case, the true wisdom is to get

as much enjoyment as possible out of the present life (chap. xv. 1-34).

But how can so strange a fact as the resurrection of a body that has become the prey of death and corruption be possible? This is a question which human reason has asked itself thousands of times in view of the promises of the Gospel, and with regard to which the strong-minded have in all ages exercised their sarcasm. St. Paul replies to it by appealing to a familiar fact of constant recurrence—the transformation of the seed, by the death which it undergoes, into a living and fruitful organism. The body raised from the dead is not the result of the gathering together of the molecules which formed the body that has gone to dust. Is there but one kind of body in the universe? Does not a glance at the earth and the heavens show an infinite multiplicity and variety of organisms? Thus the resurrection body will differ completely from the terrestrial body from which it springs; for it is to be the organ, not merely of a living soul, but, like the body of the glorified Saviour Himself, of a principle of life of a higher order, of a life-giving spirit. A transformation of the body is indispensable in order that it may become partaker of the kingdom of God, and some such change must pass even upon those who have not tasted death and are alive at the return of the Lord. A glorious victory this, a full salvation, and which we owe to Him who, by justifying us, has disarmed the law, and by sanctifying us has destroyed sin—the two pillars on which the throne of death was reared. Let us then be steadfast and immovable in the service of Him who has prepared for us so glorious a future (chap. xv. 35-58).

Such is this grand chapter, which we may doubtless take as a sample of that “wisdom among the perfect,” of which Paul speaks in chapter ii. 7 and following verses.

It only remained for him to give the Corinthians the

news and the commissions with which he usually closed his letters (chap. xvi.). These are, first, directions relative to the great collection then being made in all the Churches founded by him. Next, he tells them of his intention of visiting Greece before coming to them, a change on the plan he had at first proposed. Then he exhorts them to give a hearty welcome to Timothy, who will arrive shortly after this letter. He explains that Apollos was not willing to come to them just then, but would come some other time; and lastly, thanks them heartily for the joy he has felt in the visit of the three messengers of the Church, who are still with him when he writes, and who have brought him much spiritual refreshment. He adds some greetings, and then, just as he is closing the letter, and adding his salutation with his own hand, he puts in one awful note of warning, in the name of the coming Lord Jesus Christ—the anathema pronounced on any one at Corinth who loves Him not. Then comes the final salutation.

As we have gone through the pages of this letter, have we not felt ourselves living at Corinth, and at the same time at Ephesus, reading the very heart of Paul? We have been witnesses of the troubles of the Church, and of the fatherly solicitude of Paul for its welfare. We have learned through this one primitive Church to form an idea of all the early Churches, and we see that there is nothing ideal about them. We have followed the eye and the hand of the skilful surgeon, who knows so well how to probe and bind up its wounds. For every disorder he finds in the Gospel of Christ the true remedy. He begins the treatment of each subject by a long and detailed discussion, in which he sets forth all its aspects, and thus gradually carries with him the consciences of his readers. This is his aim, and it is only at the close of this thoughtful survey of the question that he gives some simple, practical directions, generally introduced by the conjunction *wherefore* (ὥστε)

(see chap. iii. 21 ; vi. 20 ; vii. 30 ; x. 31 ; xi. 33 ; xiv. 13 ; xiv. 39 ; xv. 58). It has sometimes been asked, why, in relation to the question of meats sacrificed to idols, he did not simply solve the difficulty by the decree of the assembly at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 23-29), and doubts have even been thrown on the genuineness of this decree because St. Paul did not thus appeal to it. It has not been understood that what the Apostle desired to insure was, not a merely legal obedience, but the free consent of fully enlightened consciences (see chap. x. 15). The most remarkable thing in the Apostle's teaching is the lofty and far-reaching view which he takes of all questions, in combination with the practical spirit, the sober and balanced judgment, which always resolves them finally in the most natural and simple manner.

In conclusion, we would call attention to that which the Apostle leaves unsaid in this letter as scarcely less admirable than what is said. The attentive reader will observe on every page of this First Epistle to the Corinthians traces of deep but repressed indignation. Paul knows very well that strictures have been passed on the apostolic teaching given by him to this Church (chap. ii. 6 ; iii. 1, 2 ; iv. 1-5) ; that there are some who make a mock of his promised visit, which he is so often obliged to defer (chap. iv. 18-21) ; that some call in question the genuineness of his Apostleship, and are raising doubt about it (ix. 1-3) ; that others refuse to regard his exhortations as coming from the Lord (xiv. 38). A storm is thus gathering between him and his Church ; this is evident. Thunder is muttering in the distance ; yet the Apostle feels that it is not the time to give vent to his sorrow. He possesses his soul in patience ; and it is only from the study of the second letter that we shall learn how the crisis came at last, and how, above all the tumult of conflicting forces, Christ made His humble servant to triumph.

F. GODET.

THE WORK OF BIBLE REVISION IN GERMANY.

I.

HISTORIC PART.

ON the 19th May—the Tuesday before Whitsunday, and eve of the Jewish Pentecost—the result of the labours devoted to the revision of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament was given forth to the Christian public of England. Reviews of the whole work and of its several parts are now appearing in the theological journals. Under these circumstances, it will certainly be of interest for the readers of *THE EXPOSITOR* to be made acquainted with the kindred task undertaken in Germany, specially since this is now brought to a provisional close.

Our great Reformer began his work of translation in the year 1517 with the seven Penitential Psalms; in September, 1522, the New Testament appeared; in 1523, the *Pentateuch*; 1524, the *Historic books* and the *Hagiographa*; 1532, the *Prophets*; 1534, the first edition of the whole Bible; 1544–45, the eleventh and last edition published by himself.

Unquestionably Luther set great store by his work. See, *e.g.* the Preface to the Old Testament (1523), at the end:—

“Now, too, the dirt will stick to the wheel, and even the rudest will think that he may master me and find fault with me here and there. Well, I take no notice of these things. I have well considered from the first that I should sooner meet with ten thousand who would find fault with my work, than *one* who should come up to me in the twentieth part of it,” etc.

And another time he writes (*Werke*, ed. Erlangen, vol. lxxv. p. 105):—

“He who will not read it can let it alone. I will beseech

and pay court to no man. It is my Testament and my Interpretation, and must and shall remain so."

In adding these last words he had in view his opponents, who were guilty of making arbitrary changes in his work, and then putting it forth under their own name, in order to damage his reputation. Such people as that Hieronymus Emser, the "dauber in Dresden," who in 1523 published a lampoon, entitled, "On what ground and cause Luther's interpretation . . . is reasonably interdicted to the common man" (Leipz. 4to), and then, in 1527, issued Luther's New Testament, with slight alterations (Dresden, fol.), under his own name. Luther himself, on another occasion, declared, "If it should be necessary to assail and find fault with me as having sometimes erred in the interpretation, I will accept it with thanks; for how often did Jerome err!" And this same Luther wrought indefatigably to his life's end on the perfecting of his great work of translation: for the seventh edition (1541) he mustered a whole "Synedrium" (Melanchthon, Aurogallus, Bugenhagen, Justus Jonas, Cruciger, and even those scholars who were only making a passing stay in Wittenberg), which held its regular sittings several times in the week. Yea, even a short time before his death he expressed his intention of once more going over the Bible, and bringing it out in a more perfect form. Augustus Herm. Francke was thus doubtless right in his conviction, that those who laboured to improve Luther's Version were acting according to the mind of Luther.

After Luther's death his work did not remain unchanged. Even the edition of the year 1546, brought out under the oversight of his *Corrector* Georg Rörer, shows many a deviation from that of the year, 1545—deviations which certainly do not proceed from the hand of Luther. Many other changes were made on the part of those who had charge of the subsequent editions; so that the Elector

Augustus of Saxony felt compelled to ordain that the text for the Lutheran Church should be conformed to the edition of 1545 (ed. Wittenberg 1581, fol.).

Towards the close of the seventeenth century endeavours after improvement began to be made on two different sides. A. H. Francke, the renowned founder of the Halle Orphanage, published (in the year 1695) his *Observationes Biblicæ, oder Anmerkungen über einige Oerter H. Schrift, . . . wo man dem eigentlichen Wortverstande näher kommen könne*. Although he expressed himself regarding the value of Luther's translation in words of warmest appreciation, he nevertheless encountered intense and violent opposition. Notably the fanatical Joh. Ferd. Mayer (Hamburg, 1695) made a passionate attack upon Francke, who in his rejoinder could point out that even before his time Luther's version had been corrected in more than three hundred places by theologians of note.

The work of Dr. Diekmann, General-Superintendent in Stade, though confined within narrower limits, was not without practical result. He brought out in 1690, 1698, and 1703, highly valued editions of the Bible. His endeavour was directed to the purging of the German text from numerous misprints and other errors, and selecting the best from the different readings of the editions accessible to him. How many errors had crept in within a little more than a century after Luther's death, owing to the lack of any central authority or Bible Society to superintend the printing of the German Bible, may be inferred from a single example; the theological faculty of the University of Wittenberg observes in the Preface to the edition issued by this body in 1661, that the said faculty had noticed more than a thousand errors in the editions current.

Baron Hildebrand von Canstein took as the basis for his first edition of the Bible, appearing in 1713, the Stade Bible of the year 1703; yet in such wise that he compared earlier

editions also, which Diekmann had not at hand, and adopted a number of emendations made directly from the original text.¹

Partly the moderately conservative procedure of Canstein and his successors, partly the great circulation which the Bibles printed in Halle had met with before the rise of other Societies, was the reason why the text diffused by the Canstein Bible Institute was more or less regarded and employed as the regulative *textus receptus*, by the British and Foreign Bible Society, the leading Prussian Bible Society, etc. Nevertheless the variations in the editions of the German Bible became more and more numerous first, because changes had been repeatedly made in the Canstein editions (notably in modernising the form of expression); and secondly, because the Bible Societies, to some extent at least, were guided by different principles.

In order to put an end to the uncertainty and confusion thus constantly arising, it was before all necessary to prepare a critically scientific foundation for further labour. To this end the University Librarian, Dr. Heinrich Ernst Bindseil, and the Director of the Canstein Bible Institute, Dr. Herm. Agathon Niemeyer, combined in 1836 for an arduous undertaking, which, owing to the ill health of the last named, was carried through by Bindseil alone. The work appeared in seven volumes, Halle, 1845-1855, with the title, *Dr. Martin Luther's Bibelübersetzung nach der letzten Original-Ausgabe kritisch bearbeitet*. Beneath the text are furnished the different readings of the other editions, whether of the whole Bible or of single parts, published under Luther's own oversight; further, the most important variations in the original text and earliest versions, as

¹ See C. H. Chr. Plath, *Carl Hildebrand Freiherr von Canstein*, Halle, 1861, p. 87 sqq.; O. Bertram, *Gesch. der Cansteinschen Bibel-anstalt*, Halle, 1863, p. 60 sqq.; C. Mönkeberg, *Beiträge zur würdigen Herstellung des Textes der Lutherischen Bibel-Uebersetzung*, Hamb., 1855, p. 19 sqq.

gathered from editions and manuscripts. This work rendered very important service in connexion with the labour of Bible revision presently to be discussed.

Before Bindseil's work had as yet been completed, the Hamburg Pastor, C. Mönckeberg, had in two publications laid stress upon the necessity for constituting a normal edition of the German Bible, employing to this end the early editions and, in case of errors affecting the sense, likewise the original text.¹

On the 21st September, 1857, a resolution was passed at a Conference of representatives of different German Bible Institutions, that "the Canstein Bible Society should be called upon to take in hand the work of revision."

The Halle Bible Institute, while not disguising the difficulty of the task, set to work with a joyful confidence. It was recognised that in the present state of science a division of the labour on its theologico-critical and its linguistic side would be a necessity. Pastor Mönckeberg undertook the preparation of the theologico-critical part of the work of revision. In the pamphlet, *Vorschläge zur Revision von Dr. Martin Luther's Bibelübersetzung*, erstes Heft (Halle, 1861; pp. 70), he divides into three classes the passages in which he counts an alteration in the ordinary editions desirable: (1) 38 passages in which a misprint occurring in the editions published during Luther's life is to be amended, or the edition of 1545 is to be restored; (2) 169 passages in which an earlier rendering of Luther is preferable to that of 1545; (3) 75 passages which call for alteration, because the rendering is entirely unintelligible or decidedly wrong. Dr. Karl Frommann in Nuremberg, aided by the counsel of the well known Germanist, Prof. Rudolf von Raumer, undertook the linguistic part of the

¹ See, (1) *Beiträge zur würdigen Herstellung*, etc., mentioned in preceding note; (2) *Zeitschrift f. christl. Wissensch. u. christl. Leben*, 1855, vol. vi Nos. 9, 10.

work of revision. Two years later than Mönckeberg he (Frommann) issued the publication, embodying the results of very diligent study, *Vorschläge zur Revision von Dr. Martin Luther's Bibelübersetzung*, zweites Heft (Halle, 1862; pp. 87). Of the "Principles for the linguistic treatment of Luther's Bible text" (*l.l.*, p. 2 sqq.) the following may be given here. After having said that the practical object must needs exert an essential influence upon the character of the work, it goes on to say: § 2. "In connexion with the formation of a practically serviceable text of the Bible, the religious need and the requirements of the school occupy the first line." § 3. "The requirement of the school demands that the understanding of the Bible should not be rendered needlessly difficult. The school must wish that the main reading book of the people should adapt itself to the language which the school has to teach and inculcate for written composition." § 4. "On the other hand, the character of the earliest text must not be sacrificed to these demands. For the force and beauty of the language gives to Luther's Bible its inestimable value, likewise for Church and school." § 15. "One need not fear giving the Word of God too much of an everyday character, in adopting the phraseology of the present. Not only its subject matter, but also the indestructible character of Luther's rendering, will always impress it with the stamp of the extraordinary. On the other side, however, we are not to expect the language of the Prophets and Apostles to differ in nothing from the ordinary forms of trivial discourse."

In the year 1863 the Eisenach Church Conference,¹ which at the wish of the Bible Societies had interested itself in behalf of the matter, passed the following resolution, of importance for the progress of the work:—

"1. The Conference deems it advisable to start in general from the

¹ A conference of representatives of the highest ecclesiastical authorities of Protestant Germany, since 1852 ordinarily convened every two years.

present text of the Canstein Bible as the basis, with special consultation of the editions published during the lifetime of Dr. M. Luther, particularly the edition to which he put the last hand; yet without on that account recurring to those linguistic forms of the early editions which have become quite foreign to our age. 2. Further, the different readings of the various Bible Societies which are now current are to be consulted, in such a way that the unity of the text-form shall be sought by the universal appropriation of the better reading; in suchwise truly that in case of doubt as to which of these readings is to be chosen, the original text shall decide it. 3. Moreover, the comparatively few passages, in the first place of the New Testament, whose alteration, in other words correction, might appear necessary and unobjectionable [!] in the interest of the understanding of Scripture, are to be restored in a manner faithfully according with the sense. 4. The Evangelical Conference will request of the various ecclesiastical administrations whom it may concern, to be helpful to the Bible Societies in doing so, particularly as regards the facilitating of mutual negotiations, the according of theological assistance, etc."

In virtue of this resolution, the following ten theologians were commissioned by their respective ecclesiastical authorities to enter upon the revision, in the first place, of the New Testament:—Nitzsch and Twesten in Berlin, Beyschlag and Riehm in Halle (for Prussia); Ahlfeld and Brückner in Leipsic (Saxony); Meyer and Niemann in Hanover; Frommüller and Schroeder (Württemberg). For the consultations the principle was laid down, that new alterations in accordance with the original text should be adopted only upon a majority of two-thirds, while the selection among the existing readings of the various editions of the German Bible should be made upon a simple plurality of votes. In the year 1867 the whole revised text of the New Testament, with the linguistic revision as superintended by Dr. Frommann, appeared in the book-shops. Ecclesiastical authorities, Bible Societies, and single individuals sent in manifold, in part feasible, expressions of their judgment. These judgments were tested by the Commission of Revisers 20th–25th April, 1868. Then, after the Eisenach Conference had assented to the results of the deliberations, the revised

text of the New Testament was printed in a new edition (32mo) by the Canstein Bible Society, in the year 1870. The emendations in Luther's version were then also adopted in the editions of other Bible Societies (*e.g.* the Stuttgart Bible Society, the Prussian Haupt-bibelgesellschaft, with few exceptions also of the British and Foreign Bible Society).

In the year 1870 the Eisenach Conference also resolved to enter upon the more comprehensive and difficult work of revising the translation of the Old Testament. On the 13th April, 1871, the Committee of Revision met for the first time. It consisted of seventeen members; namely, eight for Prussia (including Hanover), four for Saxony, three for Würtemberg, two for Saxe-Weimar. In eighteen sessions, of which ordinarily one was held in the spring and one in the autumn, or in a total of two hundred and twenty-four sittings (of which twenty-three were devoted to the Apocrypha), and numerous sittings of sub-committees, the work of revising was completed by the autumn of 1881. The fifteen revisers who still took part at the ending of the work were: Riehm and Schlottmann in Halle, Bertheau in Göttingen, Düsterdieck in Hanover, Clausen in Brügge near Kiel, Hoffmann in Frauendorf near Stettin—for Prussia; Baur and Delitzsch in Leipsic, Kühne in Dresden—for Saxony; Kübel in Tübingen, Schroeder in Cannstatt, Kapff in Balingen—for Würtemberg; Grimm in Jena—for Saxe-Weimar. The very arduous and responsible task of drawing up the results of the deliberations was undertaken by Pastor Schroeder. The parallel passages and the superscriptions of the chapters were revised by the Committee of the Stuttgart Bible Institution; which was aided by the reports of Prof. Kübel in Tübingen, and Dean Schmoller in Derendingen. The "Index for the explanation of antiquated and little known words" was remodelled by Prof. Riehm in Halle.

In November, 1883, the revised Bible appeared, under the title: "Die Bibel oder die ganze heilige Schrift des Alten und Neuen Testaments, nach der deutschen Uebersetzung D. Martin Luthers. Erster Abdruck der im Auftrage der Eisenacher deutschen evangelischen Kirchenkonferenz revidierten Bibel. (Sogenannte Prohebibel.) Halle a. S., Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses."

On the outward arrangement of this edition be it here only remarked, that all corrections of the rendering are brought into relief by distinctive type; those passages in which there has been a return from the Canstein text to Luther's text have been indicated by two vertical lines (| |) in addition to the distinctive type.

The Proof Bible is prefaced by two historic notices; one (pp. 24) by the Canstein Bible Institution, the second (pp. 38) by Pastor Schroeder.

In addition, the following writings in further illustration of the work were issued by members of the Commission for revising:

Ed. Riehm, *Das erste Buch Mose nach der deutschen Übersetzung Dr. Martin Luthers in revidirtem Text mit Vorbemerkungen und Erläuterungen.* Halle, 1873; pp. 144.

K. F. Schröder, *Die Psalmen nach der deutschen Übersetzung. Dr. M. L. in revidirtem Text mit Erläuterungen.* Halle, 1876; pp. 196.

Ed. Riehm, *Zur Revision der Lutherbibel. Über die Messianischen Stellen des A.T.* Halle, 1882; pp. 31.

E. Kühn, *Ezechiels Gesicht vom Tempel der Vollendungszeit.* Gotha, 1882; pp. 92.

W. Grimm, "Luthers Übersetzung der Apokryphen" (in *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1883).

Fr. Düsterdieck, *Die Revision der Luth. Bibelübersetzung.* Hanover, 1882; pp. 58.

E. Kühn, *Die Revision der Luth. Bibelübersetzung.* Halle, 1883; pp. 64.

P. Kleinert, *Die Revidierte Lutherbibel*. Heidelb., 1883; pp. 37.

W. Grimm, *Kurzgefasste Gesch. der lutherischen Bibelübersetzung*. Jena, 1884; pp. 86.

Franz Delitzsch, *Die revidierte Lutherbibel. Appell an die lutherische Kirche*. Leipzig, 1884; pp. 28.

K. Schlottmann, *Wider Kliefoth u. Luthardt. In Sachen der Lutherbibel*. Halle, 1885; pp. 105.

For the just appreciation of the work of revision the little work also of Theod. Schott, *D. Martin Luther und Die deutsche Bibel*, 3 Aufl., Stuttgart, 1883; pp. 48, will be found useful.

In the following (concluding) article I will mention the writings of others, directed to the criticising of the Proof Bible, and will endeavour to explain with all possible brevity the excellences and defects of the work of revision.

Berlin.

HERMANN L. STRACK.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

IX.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY IN ITS THEME, METHODS AND AIM.

“Whom we proclaim, admonishing every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ; whereunto I labour also, striving according to His working, which worketh in me mightily.”—COL. i. 28, 29 (Rev. Ver.).

THE false teachers at Colossæ had a great deal to say about a higher wisdom reserved for the initiated. They apparently treated the Apostolic teaching as trivial rudiments, which might be good for the vulgar crowd, but were known by the possessors of this higher truth to be only a veil for it. They had their initiated class, to whom their mysteries were entrusted in whispers.

Such absurdities excited Paul's special abhorrence. His whole soul rejoiced in a Gospel for all men. He had broken with Judaism on that very ground, because it sought to enforce a ceremonial exclusiveness, and demanded circumcision and ritual observances along with faith. That was, in Paul's estimate, to destroy the Gospel. These Eastern dreamers at Colossæ were trying to enforce an intellectual exclusiveness quite as much opposed to the Gospel. Paul fights with all his might against that. Its presence in the Church colours this context, where he uses the very phrases of the school in order to assert the great principles which he opposes to their teaching. "Mystery," "perfect" or initiated, "wisdom,"—these are the key-words of the system he is combating; and here he presses them into the service of the principle that the Gospel is for all men, and the inmost secrets of its deepest truth the property of every single soul that wills to receive them. Yes, he says in effect, we have mysteries. We have our initiated. We have wisdom. But we have no whispered teachings, confined to a little coterie; we have no inner chamber closed to the many. We are not muttering hierophants, cautiously revealing a little to a few, and fooling the rest with ceremonies and words. Our whole business is to tell out as fully and loudly as we can what we know of Christ, to tell to *every* man *all* the wisdom that we have learned. We fling open the inmost sanctuary, and invite all the crowd to enter.

This is the general scope of the words before us, which state the object and methods of the Apostle's work; partly in order to point the contrast with those other teachers, and partly in order to prepare the way, by this personal reference for his subsequent exhortations.

I. We have here the Apostle's own statement of what he conceived his life work to be.

"Whom we proclaim." All three words are emphatic. "*Whom*," not *what*—a person, not a system; we "*proclaim*,"

not we argue or dissertate about, but proclaim. "*We*" preach—the Apostle associates himself with all his brethren, puts himself in line with them, points to the unanimity of their testimony—"whether it were they or I, so we preach." We have all one message, a common type of doctrine.

So then "*whom* we proclaim"—the Christian teacher's theme is not to be a theory or a system, but a living Person. One peculiarity of Christianity is that you cannot take its message, and put aside Christ, the speaker of the message, as you may do with all men's teachings. Some people say: "We take the great moral and religious truths which Jesus proclaimed. They are the all-important parts of His work. We can disentangle them from any further connexion with Him. It matters comparatively little who first spoke them." But that will not do. His person is inextricably intertwined with His teaching, for a very large part of His teaching is exclusively concerned with, and all of it centres in, Himself. He is not only true, but He is the truth. His message is, not only what He said with His lips about God and man, but also what He said about Himself, and what He did in His life, death, and resurrection. You may take Buddha's sayings, and find much that is beautiful and true in them, whatever you may think of him; you may appreciate the teaching of Confucius, though you know nothing about him but that he said so and so; but you cannot do thus with Jesus. Our Christianity takes its whole colour from what we think of Him. If we think of Him as less than this chapter has been setting Him forth as being, we shall scarcely feel that *He* should be the preacher's theme; but if He is to us what He was to this Apostle, the sole Revealer of God, the Centre and Lord of creation, the Fountain of life to all which lives, the Reconciler of men with God by the blood of His cross, then the one message which a man may be thankful to spend his life in proclaiming will

be, Behold the Lamb! Let who will preach abstractions, the true Christian minister has to preach the person and the office—Jesus the Christ.

To preach Christ is to set forth the person, the facts of His life and death, and to accompany these with that explanation which turns them from being merely a biography into a Gospel. So much of “theory” must go with the “facts,” or they will be no more a Gospel than the story of another life would be. The Apostle’s own statement of “the Gospel which he preached” distinctly lays down what is needed—“how that Jesus Christ died.” That is biography, and to say that and stop there is not to preach Christ; but add, “For our sins, according to the Scriptures, and that He was raised again the third day,”—preach *that*, the fact and its meaning and power, and you will preach Christ.

Of course there is a narrower and a wider sense of this expression. There is the initial teaching, which brings to a soul, that has never seen it before, the knowledge of a Saviour, whose Cross is the propitiation for sin; and there is the fuller teaching, which opens out the manifold bearings of that message in every region of moral and religious thought. I do not plead for any narrow construction of the words. They have been sorely abused, by being made the battle-cry for bitter bigotry and a hard system of abstract theology, as unlike what Paul means by “Christ” as any cobwebs of Gnostic heresy could be. Legitimate outgrowths of the Christian ministry have been checked in their name. They have been used as a cramping iron, as a shibboleth, as a stone to fling at honest and especially at young preachers. They have been made a pillow for laziness. So that the very sound of the words suggests to some ears, because of their use in some mouths, ignorant narrowness.

But for all that, they are a standard of duty for all workers for God, which it is not difficult to apply, if the will to do so be present, and they are a touch-stone to try the spirits,

whether they be of God. A ministry of which the Christ who lived and died for us is manifestly the centre to which all converges and from which all is viewed may sweep a wide circumference, and include many themes. The requirement bars out no province of thought or experience, nor does it condemn the preacher to a parrot-like repetition of elementary truths, or a narrow round of commonplace. It does require that all themes should lead up to Christ, and all teaching point to Him; that He shall be ever present in all the preacher's words, a diffused even when not a directly perceptible presence; and that His name, like some deep tone on an organ, shall be heard sounding on through all the ripple and change of the higher notes. Preaching Christ does not exclude any theme, but prescribes the bearing and purpose of all; and the widest compass and richest variety are not only possible but obligatory for him who would in any worthy sense take this for the motto of his ministry, "I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified."

But these words give us not only the theme but something of the manner of the Apostle's activity. "*We proclaim.*" The word is emphatic in its form, meaning *to tell out*, and representing the proclamation as full, clear, earnest. "We are no muttering mystery-mongers. From full lungs and in a voice to make people hear, we shout aloud our message. We do not take a man into a corner, and whisper secrets into his ear; we cry in the streets, and our message is for 'every man.'"

And the word not only implies the plain, loud earnestness of the speaker, but also that what he speaks is a *message* that he is not a speaker of his own words or thoughts, but of what has been told him to tell. His Gospel is a good message, and a messenger's virtue is to say exactly what he has been told, and to say it in such a way that the people to whom he has to carry it cannot but hear and understand it.

This connexion of the Christian minister's office contrasts on the one hand with the priestly theory. Paul had known in Judaism a religion of which the altar was the centre, and the official function of the "minister" was to sacrifice. But now he has come to see that "the one sacrifice for sins for ever" leaves no room for a sacrificing priest in the Church of which the centre is the Cross. We sorely need that lesson to be drilled into the minds of men to-day, when such a strange resurrection of priestism has taken place, and good, earnest men, whose devotion cannot be questioned, are looking on preaching as a very subordinate part of their work. For three centuries there has not been so much need as now to fight against the notion of a priesthood in the Church, and to urge this as the true definition of the minister's office: we preach, not "we sacrifice," not "we *do*" anything; "we preach," not "we work miracles at any altar, or impart grace by any rites," but by manifestation of the truth discharge our office and spread the blessings of Christ.

This conception contrasts, on the other hand, with the false teachers' style of speech, which finds its parallel in much modern talk. Their business was to argue and refine and speculate, to spin inferences and cobwebby conclusions. They sat in a lecturer's chair; we stand in a preacher's pulpit. The Christian minister has not to deal in such wares; he has a message to proclaim, and if he allows the "philosopher" in him to overpower the "herald," and substitutes his thoughts about the message, or his arguments in favour of the message, for the message itself, he abdicates his highest office and neglects his most important function.

We hear many demands to-day for a "higher type of preaching," which I would heartily echo, if only it be *preaching*; that is, the proclamation in loud and plain utterance of the great facts of Christ's work. But many who ask for this really want, not preaching, but something quite

different; and many, as I think, mistaken Christian teachers are trying to play up to the requirements of the age by turning their sermons into dissertations, philosophical or moral or æsthetic. We need to fall back on this "we preach," and to urge that the Christian minister is neither priest nor lecturer, but a herald, whose business is to tell out his message, and to take good care that he tells it faithfully. If, instead of blowing his trumpet and calling aloud his commission, he were to deliver a discourse on acoustics and the laws of the vibration of sonorous metal, or to prove that he had a message, and to dilate on its evident truth or on the beauty of its phrases, he would scarcely be doing his work. No more is the Christian minister, unless he keeps clear before himself as the guiding star of his work this conception of his theme and his task—*whom we preach*—and opposes that to the demands of an age, one half of which "require a sign," and would again degrade him into a priest, and the other calls for "wisdom," and would turn him into a professor.

II. We have here the varying methods by which this one great end is pursued. "Admonishing every man and teaching every man in all wisdom."

There are then two main methods—"admonishing" and "teaching." The former means "admonishing with blame," and points, as many commentators remark, to that side of the Christian ministry which corresponds to repentance, while the latter points to that side which corresponds to faith. In other words, the former rebukes and warns, has to do with conduct and the moral side of Christian truth; the latter has chiefly to do with doctrine, and the intellectual side. In the one Christ is proclaimed as the pattern of conduct, the "new commandment"; in the other, as the creed of creeds, the new and perfect knowledge.

The preaching of Christ then is to be unfolded into all "warning," or admonishing. The teaching of morality and

the admonishing of the evil and the end of sin are essential parts of preaching Christ. We claim for the pulpit the right and the duty of applying the principles and pattern of Christ's life to all human conduct. It is difficult to do, and is made more so by some of the necessary conditions of our modern ministry, for the pulpit is not the place for details; and yet moral teaching which is confined to general principles is woefully like repeating platitudes and firing blank cartridges. Everybody admits the general principles, and thinks they do not apply to his specific wrong action; and if the preacher goes beyond these toothless generalities, he is met with the cry of "personalities." If a man preaches a sermon in which he speaks plainly about tricks of trade or follies of fashion, somebody is sure to say, going down the chapel steps, "Oh! ministers know nothing of business," and somebody else to add, "It is a pity he was so personal," and the chorus is completed by many other voices, "He should preach Christ, and leave secular things alone."

Well! whether a sermon of that sort be preaching Christ or not depends on the way in which it is done. But sure I am that there is no "preaching Christ" completely, which does not include plain speaking about plain duties. Everything that a man can either do rightly or wrongly belongs to the sphere of morals, and everything within the sphere of morals belongs to Christianity and to "preaching Christ."

Nor is such preaching complete without plain warning of the end of sin, as death here and hereafter. That is difficult, for many people like to have the smooth side of truth always put uppermost. But the Gospel has a rough side, and is by no means a "soothing syrup" merely. There are no rougher words about what wrongdoers come to than some of Christ's words; and he has only given half his Master's message who hides or softens down the grim saying, "The wages of sin is death."

But all this moral teaching must be closely connected

with and built upon Christ. Christian morality has Jesus for its perfect exemplar, His love for its motive, and His grace for its power. Nothing is more impotent than mere moral teaching. What is the use of perpetually saying to people, Be good, be good? You may keep on at that for ever, and not a soul will listen, any more than the crowds on our streets are drawn to church by the bell's monotonous call. But if, instead of a cold ideal of duty, as beautiful and as dead as a marble statue, we preach the Son of man, whose life is our law incarnate; and instead of urging to purity by motives which our own evil makes feeble, we re-echo His heart-touching appeal, "If ye love Me, keep My commandments"; and if, instead of mocking lame men with exhortations to walk, we point those who despairingly cry, "Who shall deliver us from the body of this death?" to Him who breathes His living Spirit into us to set us free from sin and death, then our preaching of morality will be "preaching the Gospel" and be "preaching Christ."

This Gospel is also to be unfolded into "teaching." In the facts of Christ's life and death, as we ponder them and grow up to understand them, we get to see more and more the key to all things. For thought, as for life, He is the alpha and omega, the beginning and the ending. All that we can or need know about God or man, about present duty or future destiny, about life, death, and the beyond,—all is in Jesus Christ, and to be drawn from Him by patient thought and by abiding in Him. The Christian minister's business is to be ever learning and ever teaching more and more of the "manifold wisdom" of God. He has to draw for himself from the deep, inexhaustible fountains; he has to bear the water, which must be fresh drawn to be pleasant or refreshing, to thirsty lips. He must seek to present all sides of the truth, teaching *all* wisdom, and so escaping from his own limited mannerisms. How many ministers' Bibles are all dog-eared and thumbed at certain texts, at which

they almost open of themselves, and are as clean on most of their pages as the day they were bought!

The Christian ministry, then, in the Apostle's view, is distinctly educational in its design. Preachers and hearers equally need to be reminded of this. We preachers are poor scholars ourselves, and in our work are tempted, like other people, to do most frequently what we can do with least trouble. Besides which, we many of us know, and all suspect, that our congregations prefer to hear what they have heard often before, and which gives them the least trouble. One hears the cry for "simple preaching," by which one school intends "simple instruction in plain, practical matters, avoiding mere dogma," and another intends "the simple Gospel," by which is meant the repetition over and over again of the great truth, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." God forbid that I should say a word which might even seem to under-estimate the need for that proclamation being made in its simple form, as the staple of the Christian ministry, to all who have not welcomed it into their hearts, or to forget that, however dimly understood, it will bring light and hope and new loves and strengths into a soul! But the New Testament draws a distinction between evangelists and teachers, and common sense insists that Christian people need more than the reiteration of that message from him whom they call their "teacher." If he is, he should teach; and he cannot do that, if the people who listen to him suspect everything that they do not know already, and are impatient of anything that gives them the trouble of attending and thinking in order to learn. I fear there is much unreality in the name, and that nothing would be more distasteful to many of our congregations than the preacher's attempt to make it truly descriptive of his work. Sermons should not be "quiet resting places." Nor is it quite the ideal of Christian teaching that busy men should come to church or chapel on

a Sunday, and not be fatigued by being made to think, but perhaps be able to drop to sleep for a minute or two and pick up the thread when they wake, quite sure that they have missed nothing of any consequence.

We are meant to be teachers, as well as evangelists, though we fulfil the function so poorly; but our hearers often make that task more difficult by ill-concealed impatience with sermons which try to discharge it.

Observe too the emphatic repetition of "every man" both in these two clauses and in the following. It is Paul's protest against the exclusiveness of the heretics, who shut out the mob from their mysteries. An intellectual aristocracy is the proudest and most exclusive of all. A Church built upon intellectual qualifications would be as hard and cruel a *coterie* as could be imagined. So there is almost vehemence and scorn in the persistent repetition in each clause of the obnoxious word, as if he would thrust down his antagonists' throats the truth that his Gospel has nothing to do with cliques and sections, but belongs to the world. To it philosopher and fool are equally welcome. Its message is to all. Brushing aside surface diversities, it goes straight to deep-lying wants, which are the same in all men. Below king's robe and professor's gown, and workman's jacket and prodigal's rags, beats the same heart, with the same wants, wild longings, and weariness. Christianity knows no hopeless classes. But its highest wisdom can be spoken to the little child and the barbarian, and it is ready to deal with the most forlorn and foolish, knowing its own power to "warn every man and to teach every man in all wisdom."

III. We have here the ultimate aim of these diverse methods. "That we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus."

We found this same word "present" in verse 22. The remarks made there will apply here. There the

Divine purpose of Christ's great work, and here Paul's purpose in his, are expressed alike. God's aim is Paul's aim too. The Apostle's thoughts travel on to the great coming day, when we shall all be manifested at the judgment seat of Christ, and preacher and hearer, Apostle and convert, shall be gathered there. That solemn period will test the teacher's work, and should ever be in his view as he works. There is a real and indissoluble connexion between the teacher and his hearers, so that in some sense he is to blame if they do not stand perfect then, and he in some sense has to present them as in some sense his work—the gold, silver, and precious stones which he has built on the foundation. So each preacher should work with that end clear in view, as Paul did. He is always toiling in the light of that great vision. One sees him, in all his letters, looking away yonder to the horizon, where he expects the slow breaking of its morning low down in the eastern sky. Ah! how many a formal pulpit and how many a languid pew would be galvanised into intense action if only their occupants once saw, burning in on them, in their decorous deadness, the light of that great white throne! How differently we should preach if we always felt "the terror of the Lord," and under its solemn influence sought to "persuade men"! How differently we should hear if we felt that we must appear before the Judge, and give account to Him of our profitings by His word!

And the purpose which the true minister of Christ has in view is to "present every man *perfect in Christ Jesus*." "Perfect" may be used here with the technical signification of "initiated," but it means absolute moral completeness. Negatively, it implies the entire removal of all defects; positively, the complete possession of all that belongs to human nature as God meant it to be. The Christian aim. for which the preaching of Christ

supplies ample power, is to make the whole race possess, in fullest development, the whole circle of possible human excellences. There is to be no one-sided growth, but men are to grow like a tree in the open, which has no barrier to hinder its symmetry, but rises and spreads equally on all sides, with no branch broken or twisted, no leaf worm-eaten or wind-torn, no fruit blighted or fallen, no gap in the clouds of foliage, no bend in the straight stem,—a green and growing completeness. This absolute completeness is attainable “in Christ,” by union with Him of that vital sort brought about by faith, which will pour His Spirit into our spirits. The preaching of Christ is therefore plainly the direct way to bring about this perfecting. That is the Christian theory of the way to make perfect men.

And this absolute perfection of character is, in Paul’s belief, possible for every man, no matter what his training or natural disposition may have been. The Gospel is confident that it can change the Ethiopian’s skin, because it can change his heart, and the leopard’s spots will be altered when it “eats straw like the ox.” There are no hopeless classes, in the glad, confident view of the man who has learned Christ’s power.

What a vision of the future to animate work! What an aim! What dignity, what consecration, what enthusiasm it would give, making the trivial great and the monotonous interesting, stirring up those who share it to intense effort, overcoming low temptations, and giving precision to the selection of means and use of instruments! The pressure of a great, steady purpose consolidates and strengthens our powers, which, without it, become flaccid and feeble. We can make a piece of calico as stiff as a board by putting it under an hydraulic press. Men with a fixed purpose are terrible men. They crash through conventionalities like a cannon ball. They, and they only, can persuade and arouse and impress their own enthusiasm on the inert mass.

“Behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth!” No Christian minister will work up to the limits of his power, nor do much for Christ or man, unless his whole soul is mastered by this high conception of the possibilities of his office, and unless he is on fire with the ambition to present every man “perfect in Christ Jesus.”

IV. Note the struggle and the strength with which the Apostle reaches towards this aim. “Whereunto I labour also, striving according to His working, which worketh in me mightily.”

As to the object, theme, and method of the Christian ministry, Paul can speak, as he does in the previous verses, in the name of all his fellow workers: “*We* preach, admonishing and teaching, that *we* may present.” There was substantial unity among them. But he adds a sentence about his own toil and conflict in doing his work. He will only speak for himself now. The others may say what their experience has been. He has found that he cannot do his work *easily*. Some people may be able to get through it with little toil of body or agony of mind, but for himself it has been laborious work. He has not learned to “take it easy.” That great purpose has been ever before him, and made a slave of him. “I labour *also*”; I do not only preach, but I *toil*—as the word literally implies—like a man tugging at an oar, and putting all his weight into each stroke. No great work for God will be done without physical and mental strain and effort. Perhaps there were people in Colossæ who thought that a man who had nothing to do but to preach had a very easy life, and so the Apostle had to insist that the most exhausting work is brain work and heart work. Perhaps there were preachers and teachers there who worked in a leisurely, dignified fashion, and took great care always to stop a long way on the safe side of weariness; and so he had to insist that God’s work cannot be done at all in that fashion, but has to be done “with

both hands, earnestly." The "immortal garland" is to be run for, "not without dust and heat." The racer who takes care to slack his speed whenever he is in danger of breaking into a perspiration will not win the prize. The Christian minister who is afraid of putting all his strength into his work, up to the point of weariness, will never do much good.

There must be not only toil, but conflict. He labours, "*striving*"—that is to say, contending—with hindrances, both without and within, which sought to mar his work. There is the struggle with one's self, with the temptations to do high work from low motives, or to neglect it, and to substitute routine for inspiration and mechanism for fervour. One's own evil, one's weaknesses and fears and falsities, and laziness and torpor and faithlessness, have all to be fought, besides the difficulties and enemies without. In short, all good work is a battle.

The hard strain and stress of this life of effort and conflict made this man "Paul the aged" while he was not old in years. This soul's agony and travail is indispensable for all high service of Christ. How can any true, noble Christian life be lived without continuous effort and continual strife? Up to the last particle of our power, it is our duty to work. As for the sleepy, languid, self-indulgent service of modern Christians, who seem to be chiefly anxious not to overstrain themselves, and manage to win the race set before them without turning a hair, I am afraid that a large deduction will have to be made from it in the day that shall "try every man's work, of what sort it is."

So much for the struggle; now for the strength. The toil and the conflict are to be carried on "according to His working, which worketh in me mightily." The measure of our power then is Christ's power in us. He whose presence makes the struggle necessary, by His presence strengthens us for it. He will dwell in us and work in us, and even our weakness will be lifted into joy

ful strength by Him. We shall be mighty because that mighty Worker is in our spirits. We have not only His presence beside us as an ally, but His grace within us. We may not only have the vision of our Captain standing at our side as we front the foe—an unseen presence to them, but inspiration and victory to us,—but we may have the consciousness of His power welling up in our spirits and flowing, as immortal strength, into our arms. It is much to know that Christ fights for us: it is more to know that He fights in us.

Let us take courage then for all work and conflict; and remember that if we have not “striven according to the power”—that is, if we have not utilized *all* our Christ-given strength in His service—we have not striven enough. There may be a double defect in us. We may not have taken all the power that He has given, and we may not have used all the power that we have taken. Alas for us! we have to confess both faults. How weak we have been when Omnipotence waited to give Itself to us! How little we have made our own of the grace that flows so abundantly past us, catching such a small part of the broad river in our hands, and spilling so much even of that before it reached our lips! And how little of the power given, whether natural or spiritual, we have used for our Lord! How many weapons have hung rusty and unused in the fight! He has sowed much in our hearts, and reaped little. Like some unkindly soils, we have “drunk in the rain which cometh oft upon it,” and have “*not* brought forth herbs fit for Him by whom it is dressed.” Talents hid, the Master’s goods squandered, power allowed to run to waste, languid service and half-hearted conflict, we have all to acknowledge. Let us go to Him and confess that “we have most unthankful been,” and are unprofitable servants indeed, coming far short of duty. Let us yield our spirits to His influence, that He

may work in us that which is pleasing in His sight, and may encircle us with ever-growing completeness of beauty and strength, until He "present us faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy."

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

ON GENESIS XVIII., XIX.

EWALD has called Gen. xviii. 1 to xix. 29, "the most perfect specimen of a miniature epic." There are those who are offended at the anthropomorphic cast of the language. I confess however that I greatly sympathize with Delitzsch, who regards it as a prophetic anticipation of the Christian view of God. It may be that the law deepened the sense of holiness, but it was at the expense of that childlike confidence in the Divine sympathies, which, according to the Book of Genesis, was the glory of the patriarchal age. Notice in passing, that, abundant as are the parallels to the narrative in Gen. xviii. in Aryan mythology (*e.g.* the lovely one in Ovid, *Met.*, viii. 626-721), there are none, so far as I remember, in the fragments of Semitic mythology as yet known to us, and none in the mythology of Egypt. That the men of the Nile valley should have no such genial narratives, is only what might be expected; their religious system was wholly deficient in points of contact between the human and the Divine. I have not now time to discuss the religious significance of the narratives in Gen. xviii., xix. (see however the few remarks hazarded below); readers of that treasure of high religious philosophy, Schleiermacher's *Predigten*, will perhaps remember that the great Berlin preacher and theologian has not neglected the fine opportunity presented to him by this masterpiece of Hebrew narrative.

It is rather the crisis of the story to which I would call attention; Prof. Hull's recent book, published by the Palestine Exploration Fund, has doubtless disposed for ever—if a final blow was needed—of the theory, traceable in such a critical or hypercritical work as Hitzig's *History of the People of Israel* (1869), that the cities of the "Pentapolis" were swallowed up by the lake now called the Dead Sea. But how came the theory to take such a hold of the popular mind? May it not be accounted for by the fact that stories of the submergence of guilty cities are current in different parts of the world, and that these have given colouring to our view of the Sodom narrative? Tobler, the well-known Swiss scholar and student of Palestinian geography, has pointed out a tradition current in the canton of Thun, that a certain place on the shore of the Lake of Thun was overwhelmed by the waters, because a dwarf was refused hospitality during a storm by all the inhabitants except an aged couple who dwelt in a movable cottage. Comp. Ovid, as above. (See *Im Neuer Reich*, 1873, p. 167.) The North Sea and the German Ocean have similar stories of the destruction of cities or towns once situated on their shores. Wetzstein furnishes a parallel from Bedouin folklore, which is the more important, because the moral motive for the catastrophe is mentioned. Remarking on the beauty of a crystal-clear lake (but without fish), connected subterraneously with the Jordan-spring Tell-el-Kâdi, his companions expressed their wonder that the Franks were ignorant of its origin. Once, they said, a flourishing village stood here, whose people refused hospitality, with aggravating circumstances, to a poor traveller; the next morning after he had asked it in vain, a lake stood upon the site of the village (Delitzsch, *Hiob*, p. 418). There may have been such a tradition current respecting the "Pentapolis," but if so it has not been preserved. The Biblical references, exclusive of Gen. xix. 24, point however

to an earthquake as the form of the Divine judgment; כהפכה, "overthrow" is the standing phrase in Isa. i. 7; xiii. 19; Amos iv. 11; Jer. xlix. 18; l. 40; Deut. xxix. 23 (22); and this agrees with the phraseology of Gen. xix. 25 (ויהפך), and (if the parallelism be worth anything) of *Korán*, Sur. ix. 71; liii. 54; lxix. 9. Wetzstein too has told us that stories of cities *overthrown* by Divine judgment are frequent on the borders of the desert (see Delitzsch, *Hiob*, p. 197; the cities are called *maqlûbât*, i.e. "subverted," which is in harmony with the standing phrase in Hebrew mentioned above. It has been conjectured that the Hebrew narrator combined *two traditions*, one representing an earthquake, the other a Divine fire, as the cause of the destruction; and the conjecture may be supported (or excused?) by a passage in Strabo (p. 374), in which he describes the destruction of *thirteen* cities, and the Dead Sea as caused by earthquakes and eruptions of fire and hot waters, and another in Josephus (*B. J.*, iv. 8, 4, comp. *Ant.*, i. 11, 4), ascribing it to lightning or "Divine fire."

Professor Palmer, in travelling through the mountains of the "Azázimeh, came upon blocks of stone, with a story attached, which the lamented professor regards as 'a transplanted reminiscence of the story of Sodom and Gomorrhah'" (*Pal. Explor. Fund Quarterly Statement*, new series, No. 1, p. 47). I do not see the least ground for this supposition. Retributive justice was the fundamental attribute of the Divine nature, according to all the Semitic peoples—and indeed all nations everywhere—in the primitive state represented more or less accurately in Genesis; the mental soil was ready for such legends to spring up, wherever an opportunity favoured. I say nothing about the historical (or "literally true") character of these stories, for evidence which a critic would call historical is wanting. Wetzstein ventures on the remark that the narrative of Sodom is more at home in the *dîn Ibrâhîm* (the primitive Semitic religion

attached to the name of Abraham) than in Mosaism. I do not think this is entirely justified. There are elements in the story as given in Genesis worthy of the "merciful and gracious" name ascribed to God in Exod. xxxiv. 6; I refer of course to the truly Divine saying, "I will not destroy it for ten's sake" (Gen. xviii. 32). I cannot therefore join in any disparagement of this poetic and significant group of narratives in Gen. xviii., xix. But Biblical theologians are content if the narratives of which their materials are partly composed are *true*, though not in all cases real—*wahre, obwohl nicht immer wirkliche, Geschichten* (comp. Prof. Wordsworth, *Bampton Lectures* for 1881, p. 138). The elements derived by Biblical theology from Gen. xviii., xix., are the combination of justice and compassion in the dealings of God with men, and the mysterious solidarity of men both for good and for evil.

T. K. CHEYNE.

"I HAVE RECEIVED OF THE LORD."

1 CORINTHIANS xi. 23.

I CONFESS that I cannot extract full satisfaction from any of the current interpretations of this difficult passage. There are minds, indeed, that can rest content with believing that the risen Christ on some occasion communicated to the converted Paul an historical account, such as he could have obtained from the common tradition of the primitive Church; and some indeed press even for the actual words as part of the revelation. To other minds, however, what appears an unnecessary multiplication of revelations, is antecedently improbable and so far incredible; nor do they derive much comfort from the suggestion that "we need"

not wonder if words so important were specially communicated to the one prominent apostle who was not present at the Last Supper," or any sensible relief from being told that the preposition (*ἀπὸ*) used in the phrase "from the Lord" leaves scope for the operation of "an angel, or the direct voice of the Spirit, or a divinely-sent human messenger."¹ Their initial difficulty is still the same. The more rationalistic contrivance, on the other hand, of understanding "from the Lord" to mean "from the Lord as the original giver, but through the medium of His followers, the recognised depositaries of tradition," appears to some (as it does to me) to do violence somewhat to the structure of the Apostle's language, and to be at any rate seriously incomplete as an explanation of his drift. The alternative, that the tradition first learned by St. Paul from the ordinary source, was subsequently confirmed to him by a revelation, is little better than an attempt to suppress one difficulty by the invocation of a greater; for it means nothing less than this, that the Lord paid the Twelve the doubtful honour of guaranteeing their historical truthfulness.

Before endeavouring to state what I cannot but think a more reasonable view, it will be well perhaps to clear the path. And, first, I would submit that no stress can be laid upon the preposition *ἀπὸ*, one way or the other. Without entering into a disquisition on the special distinction between *ἀπὸ* and *παρά* in such a connexion, it will be sufficient to point out that Meyer, who claims *παρά* as the natural preposition for immediate reception, is flatly contradicted by Canon Evans, a no less brilliant and painstaking scholar, who frankly and tersely expounds: "Here *of* means *straight from*; *ἀπὸ* not *παρά*: Meyer quite wrong here." Bishop Lightfoot, too, in his note on Galatians i. 12 ("Neither did I receive it from man") declares altogether against *immediate* transmission being specially in-

¹ Compare Mr. Beet on the passage.

volved in either preposition. And, if I may venture to have an opinion after a study of Pauline instances, I believe that there is at least as much to be said for Canon Evans as for Meyer, Winer, Buttmann, and all their English followers. But, after all, in this passage, ἀπό may have been chosen merely for the sake of change, to avoid the threefold jingle, παρελαβον, παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, παρέδωκα.

Yet an objector may say: "There is the ἐγώ: it is emphatic, and obviously opposed to the ὑμῖν. 'I have received from the Lord as straight as you have received from me.'" There is something, I think, in this; but too much must not be made of it. For it is by no means certain that the classical emphasis of the personal pronouns always clings to them in New Testament Greek; and the purists in this respect have the air of being somewhat in straits to find a natural emphasis for the ἐγώ in "I send you forth as sheep among wolves" (Matt. x. 16); or, again, in "I died to the law, that I might live to God" (Gal. ii. 19). In the passage, "Who is weak, and I am not weak? Who is offended, and I burn not?" (2 Cor. xi. 29)—the absence of ἐγώ in the first clause and its presence in the second, cannot be explained in accordance with any strict rule. Such laxity seems to call for special recognition in the simpler narrative style of the Gospels. But to come nearer home. The ἐγώ is omitted in a passage hard by and closely akin to ours (1 Cor. xv. 3) where Paul is summarising the cardinal points of doctrine (ἐν πρώτοις) in the Gospel he had originally preached to his Corinthian hearers. His expression elsewhere, "my Gospel" (e.g. Rom. ii. 16), and his claim to have received this Gospel "not from man" (Gal. i. 12), would have made ἐγώ very suitable here; and at first sight partly justify those who append "from the Lord" to their translation of παρέλαβον. Certainly, to any but the sacramental mind, the contents of Paul's Gospel here detailed are at least as important as the institution of

the Last Supper; for on some of these historical facts the significance of that Supper was based. And yet he leaves the *ὁ καὶ παρέλαβον* ("which also I received") to be strictly parallel to the previous *ὁ καὶ παρέλάβετε* ("which also ye received"),—both clauses without any expressed pronoun; and both apparently referring to the ordinary channels of tradition. For, among the points of his preaching he mentions the appearances of the Lord to Cephas and to James, and, last of all, the appearance to himself. Undoubtedly Cephas and James had learned of this last appearance from the lips of Paul: it is surely unreasonable then to suppose that Paul had learned of the appearances to James and Cephas, straight from the Lord Himself.

Other interpreters lay the whole emphasis on the *ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου* ("from the Lord"). As if Paul were saying: "Many ordinances I have made for your governance, that all things may be done decently and in order; but these have been appointed according to the best of my own judgment—by 'me, not the Lord':¹ *this* ordinance is from the Lord—'the Lord, not me': it is the '*Lord's* Supper': it is He who says, 'This do': it is His death ye show forth, His body and His blood ye partake of, His judgment and His chastening ye have to fear." This exegesis is tempting, but it appears to ignore too much the *ἐγὼ παρέλαβον*.

The use of the singular number of the verb is sometimes adduced as a proof of the immediateness of the transmission from the Lord. But Paul had been the teacher and the organizer of the Corinthian Church; its order and its customs were due to him, however much, just now, they came short of his model; and, therefore, I submit that it would have been unnatural for him here to say: "*We* received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you." And especially so to the Corinthians. Even at this stage

¹ See 1 Cor. vii. 12.

some of them were questioning his commission and authority (1 Cor. ix. 1-8), and a tone of unavoidable self-assertion pervades both Epistles. He is forced to remind them that in his Gospel and his apostleship, he is, "at any rate to them" (1 Cor. ix. 2), not a whit behind the other apostles; that his commission is as full and as direct as theirs. To the Corinthians he was more likely to use *I* than *we*.

But in what sense is he speaking truthfully if he owed his knowledge of the story of the Last Supper to others? I believe that the *facts*, like those mentioned in the fifteenth chapter, came to him in the ordinary way; and yet I cannot believe that Paul is resting, first of all and consciously, upon tradition, when, to rebuke the disorder and disunion of the Corinthian Church, he recalls the solemnity and significance of the institution he had delivered to them, as received by him from the Lord. The point would be blunted if a direct commission were not claimed. But this need not have been in itself a revelation of historical facts; it *must* have been a revelation of their import. And, indeed, it is the import of the facts—their imperious significance for Christian fellowship—that is the ground of his argument and his censure. Paul, as Christ's directly commissioned messenger, summons the Corinthians to conform to the spirit of his message.

Does it then follow that the Apostle is open to the charge of confusing letter and spirit, the objective and the subjective, the Christ without and the Christ within? Far from it. To confuse is one thing; to merge, another. To the Apostle there were not two Christs, the past and the present: the past co-existed with the present, and a greater than the past was there. The internal Christ was only the perfected phase of the historical. The Christ of the past, still existing, yet one with the Christ of the present, had taken up His abode in the Apostle: the Christ of the past, a

memory of sanctity ; the Christ of the present, a sanctifying faith.¹ On stepping-stones of the Christ of history, the Christ after the flesh, he had risen to the Christ of faith, Christ the quickening Spirit ; and this " Lord " was, above all other conceptions of Him, the " Lord " of Paul. Without Him, Paul's memory would have been but the storehouse of dead traditional facts ; but with Him came the breath of life ; till, having " received from the Lord " the soul of his Gospel, Paul cared not always to refer to another source the existence and origin of the body.

And thus, with the letter only from tradition, the spirit from revelation, Paul may well be pardoned for merging history in faith, and claiming to have received the whole message from the Lord.

JOHN MASSIE.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

III.

THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS.

IN the early chapters of this book the reader will notice for himself several small alterations which it is unnecessary to particularize in detail, but which considerably elucidate the different observances prescribed.

i. 3. *That he may be accepted.* This is the meaning regularly borne by the phrase employed (לְרִצּוֹנוֹ; see xxiii. 11 A.V., and cf. xxii. 19 f. ; Jer. vi. 20 ; Isa. lvi. 7), and is expressed by LXX. (δεκτὸν), Vulg. (acceptabilis), Onkelos (יקריב יתה לרעוא ליה), and the Peshitto (ܠܚܥܝܐ ܝܬܗ ܠܪܥܝܐ). A.V. follows a Talmudic interpretation accepted by Aben Ezra and other Jewish authorities, and adopted by many of the

¹ Compare Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 70.

translators of the 16th century (Seb. Münster, *propria sua voluntate*).

ii. 1. *Meal offering*. See the Preface. The word *meat* denoted formerly "all kinds of victuals except bread and drink" (W. Aldis Wright's *Bible Word Book*, s.v.); but its retention here (unlike, *e.g.* Deut. xx. 20) in a modern version could not but mislead.

iii. 9. *Fat tail*. See on Exod. xxix. 22.

v. 1. *Adjuration*. The passage may be illustrated from Judg. xvii. 2 and Prov. xxix. 24.

4. *Rashly*, or "speaking unadvisedly." The word is the same as in Ps. cvi. 33.

v. 14-vi. 7. This section (with a separate title, cf. iv. 1; vi. 8) should be treated as if it formed a chapter by itself. It deals with the *āshām*, or "guilt-offering" (1 Sam. vi. 3, 8, 17; Isa. liii. 10 [see R.V. margin]), the nature of which is most clearly explained by Oehler, *Theology of the O. T.*, § 137-8. The verb עָשָׂה means to *contract guilt*, and is quite different from עָלָה to *commit a trespass* (v. 15; vi. 2) with which, in the rendering of A.V. ("trespass-offering") the sacrifice might have appeared to be connected. Briefly, it may be said that the cases for which the *āshām* is prescribed are all reducible to the category of a right infringed or a due withheld: where this can be estimated at a money value a fine is imposed as compensation to the injured person; while the accompanying sacrifice gives satisfaction for the "trespass" (which is of course involved) towards God. It must not be confused with the "sin-offering."

vi. 2-5. The improvements in the R.V. will be self-evident.

vi. 18. Not "a statute . . . concerning," but "a due . . . out of" (כֶּסֶף). "*Throughout* your generations," *i.e.* in temporal succession. The phrase is the same as in Gen. xvii. 7, 9, 12; Exod. xii. 14, 17, and often.

viii. 33 *marg.* The Hebrew phrase is a metaphor implying institution or installation in an office. Compare Exod. xxviii. 41; xxix. 9; Lev. xvi. 32; xxi. 10; Judg. xvii. 5; 1 Kings xiii. 33; Ezek. xliii. 26. The corresponding substantive occurs vv. 22, 28, 29, 31, 33; chap. vii. 37; Exod. xxix. 22, 26, 27, 31, 34.

xi. 5. *Coney.* "Coney" is the old English word for a rabbit, but it is now practically obsolete in that sense, and is thus still available as the familiar and convenient rendering of the Hebrew *shāphān*, the animal which this word strictly denotes being indicated in the margin. A representation of the *shāphān* will be found in Tristram's *Natural History of the Bible*, p. 75; as in appearance and habits it is not unlike a rabbit (though belonging to a different family), the name *coney* is not an unsuitable designation.

13. *Eagle.* *Marg. Or, great vulture.* According to the same authority (p. 172 ff.), the Arabic *nīsr*, which corresponds to the Hebrew *nesher*, denotes, not the eagle strictly so called, but the Griffon-Vulture or Great Vulture (distinct from the ordinary or Egyptian vulture, ver. 18; *ib.* p. 179 f.). The eagle does not, for example, congregate around carrion (Job xxxix. 30; Matt. xxiv. 28), nor has it down instead of feathers upon its neck and head (Micah i. 16), whereas both these characteristics suit the Griffon-Vulture. The term *eagle*, however, suggests such fine associations, and is so adequate as a poetical equivalent for *nesher* (and it is in poetry that the word most frequently occurs) that it would have been unreasonable to displace it; in a version intended for popular use it is sufficient for the true sense to be given in the margin.

18. *Ostrich* for *owl*. So Micah i. 8 (where allusion is made to the loud and dolorous sounds which the ostrich often emits during night); Isa. xiii. 21; xxxiv. 13, etc. The ostrich is admitted to be the creature meant, and it is the

rendering of all the ancient versions. The literal meaning of the Hebrew term is (probably) "daughter of the steppes," see Wetzstein's note in Delitzsch's *Job* (on xxxix. 17).

29. *Great lizard*. LXX. κροκόδειλος χερσαῖος: Syr. and the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan קֶרֶסֶת, which denotes a species of lizard; Saadyah (10th cent.) in his Arabic version uses the corresponding Arabic word ضب, which likewise means a lizard. The rendering of A.V., *tortoise*, is based upon Talmudic authorities.

Particulars on the other animals named will be found in the Commentaries.

xiv. 10. *Tenth parts* of an ephah. So regularly for the obscure "deals" (i.e. doles, portions) of A.V.; e.g. Exod. xxix. 40; chap. xxiii. 13, 17; and often in Num. xxviii.--xxix.

xvi. 8, 10, 26. *For Azazel*. The word only occurs here in the O.T. The rendering of A.V. *scape-goat*, inherited from the "Great Bible," may be traced back through Seb. Münster ("caper abiturus"), Coverdale ("the free goat"), Luther ("der ledige Bock"), and Jerome (*caper emissarius*), to the τράγος ἀπερχόμενος (ver. 10 ἀφιέμενος) of Symmachus (2nd cent.); but implies a derivation (עֲזָזִיל = עֲזָזִיל) opposed to the genius of Hebrew, and is not compatible with the language of ver. 26 (where the construction, if the שְׁעִיר be identical with עֲזָזִיל, would be almost unparalleled). The Jews¹ mostly interpret it as the name of a steep and diffi-

¹ Guided doubtless by what was actually the practice in the time of the Second Temple ("to send it away, that it may perish in a strong and difficult place in the wilderness of *šūq* (צֹוק) which is Beth Hādūdē"—Ps.-Jon. on ver. 10; similarly Mishna *Yoma*, ch. vi. ; *Siphra*, ad loc.; Rashi, etc.). The place in question is stated in the Mishna (*l.c.*) to have been twelve miles from Jerusalem; and has been recently identified, with much probability, with a spot now called *ṭanṭur ḥudēdūn*, nearly due east of Jerusalem, and at the required distance, where the traveller, "suddenly reaching the edge of the chalk range, looks down a steep declivity, on the opposite side of which rises the high chalk hill *ṭanṭur ḥudēdūn*" (Schick in the *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palestina-Vereins*, 1880, p. 218, whose conclusions are endorsed, p. 219, by Delitzsch). These Jewish explanations plainly express the view that the first part of the word is the Hebrew *ṭṭ* strong (or some supposed derivative from the same root) but offer no satisfactory etymology of the word as a whole.

cult rock in the wilderness; but the marked antithesis in which the word stands to "the LORD" is strongly in favour of the opinion that some personal being is denoted by it; and it is now almost universally regarded as the name of an evil spirit, popularly supposed to have its dwelling in the desert.¹ This indeed is the sense which the LXX. probably attached to the word (ver. 8 . . . καὶ κλήρον ἓνα τῷ ἀποπομπαίῳ²), and which was understood by Origen, who even supposes it to denote the devil.³ Of modern authorities, it will be sufficient to refer to Ewald, *Antiquities of Israel*, p. 362 f., and *Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott*, ii. p. 291 f.; Oehler, § 140; Schultz, *Alttest. Theol.*, p. 437-9. The derivation of the word remains obscure. *Azala* in Arabic means *to remove, place far apart*, hence it has been thought possible that it may have denoted the *avert*er of evil (Gesenius), or have been the name of a spirit, supposed to *divert* travellers in the desert from their way (Dillmann). Any meaning, however, that may be assigned to it must be clearly understood to be conjectural; in the text it appears simply as a proper name, and its use there authorizes no inferences as to the sense which it may have originally expressed; if, for instance, it once meant *avert*er of evil, it cannot be said any longer to have distinctly that sense in Leviticus. The later Jews gave the name Azazel to an evil spirit, who seduced men to evil (Enoch viii. 1, 2; x. 4-8); but this application may have been merely derived from the passage

¹ Comp. xvii. 7 marg.; Isa. xiii. 31; xxxiv. 14.

² i.e. ἀλεξικάκῃ, the *avert*er of evil. In ver. 10 and 26, the rendering of LXX. is freer; ὥστε ἀποστεῖλαι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ἀποπομπήν, and εἰς ἀφεσιν. Classical writers state that ἀποπομπαῖος was an epithet given to divinities who averted curses. The word occurs, however, in a passive sense: and the LXX. may have so applied it, treating it as an epithet of the goat.

³ c. *Cels.*, p. 305 (vi. 43), understanding, however, ἀποπ. in a passive sense; ἔτι δὲ ὁ ἐν τῷ Λευιτικῷ ἀποπομπαῖος, ὃν ἡ Ἑβραϊκὴ γραφὴ ὠνόμασεν Ἀζαζήλ, οὐδεὶς ἔτερος ἦν [ἢ ὁ διάβολος], ὃν ἀποπέμπεσθαι καὶ ἀποτροπιάζεσθαι ἔδει τὸν κλήρον ἔχοντα ἐν ἐρήμῳ.

⁴ Names of other spirits without any basis in O.T., mentioned in the same book are Semyázâ, Akibêêl, Tâmiêl, Râmuêl,—also Dânel, Ezekêel, etc.

before us, and does not necessarily embody an independent or original tradition.¹

The symbolism of the rite may be explained as follows. By the goat upon which the lot fell to be Jehovah's (which was offered in the ordinary way as a sin-offering, though with the special feature of the application of the blood to the mercy-seat), atonement was made for the sins of the nation. But upon this solemn occasion it was not sufficient for the sins of the people to be sacrificially expiated; they must, by a visible figure, be banished from the nation's midst. For this purpose the sins, already (symbolically) cancelled and forgiven by the sacrifice of the first goat, are laid symbolically by confession upon the second goat,² which is then dismissed into the wilderness *for Azazel*. From our ignorance of the precise nature of the ideas associated with Azazel, the exact meaning of this part of the ceremonial can only be assigned conjecturally: probably however it is meant as a symbolical declaration that the land and people are now purged from guilt; their sins being handed over to the evil spirit to whom they are held to belong, and whose home is in the desolate wilderness, remote from human habitations. It is quite possible that this particular rite may be a survival from an older stage of popular belief, engrafted on and accommodated to the

¹ The rendering *for dismissal* is not probable. Not only is the antithetic *for Jehovah* unfavourable to it, but the form of the Hebrew word is very peculiar, and it is not one likely to have been in use to express such a simple idea as that of dismissal.

² The interpretation of *to make atonement for him*, in ver. 10, is very difficult and uncertain. Most probably it means that, as the altars of burnt-offering and incense were prepared for their sacred use by a rite of expiation (Exod. xxix. 36 (Lev. viii. 15); xxx. 10), so the goat was here similarly consecrated for the solemn purpose which it had to subserve (Oehler, § 140. 18, 19; Schultz, p. 433 note). The rendering *with* (A.V.) is against usage. The marginal *over* (i.e. to go through the ceremonial described ver. 21 over the goat), may be supported by Exod. xxx. 10 ("upon the horns"), but is not the usual sense of the Hebrew phrase.

sacrificial theory of the Hebrews, though its significance, as an element in the ritual for the day of atonement, will naturally be independent of any theories which we may form as to its *ultimate* origin and nature. With the dismissal of the goat bearing the sins of the people into the wilderness has often been compared the ceremonial in the purification for leprosy (chap. xiv. 7, 53), where the living bird let loose into the open field is generally considered to symbolize the complete removal of the plague from the person (or place) afflicted by it. It need hardly be said that the goat is not to be interpreted as a *sacrifice* to Azazel.

22. *A solitary land.* Lit., a land cut off; *i.e.* either a region remote from men (LXX. γῆ ἄβατος; Vulg., *terra solitaria*), or one whence the animal might not be able to find its way back. In either case the object is evident, viz. to insure the complete banishment of the sins. The rendering of A.V., “a land *not inhabited*,” follows an old Jewish paraphrase (Onkelos, לא יתבא; Münster, *in terram non habitabilem*).

xvii. 7. marg. See Isa. xiii. 21; xxxiv. 14; and compare 2 Chron. xi. 15. Though the Hebrew word is literally *he-goat*, these passages (in which the word is the same) make it probable that it is applied metaphorically, as in the rendering of the margin, to imaginary beings, who were supposed in popular superstition to haunt the deserts (LXX. τοῖς ματαίοις; Vulg. *dæmonibus*; Targ., Pesh. שדים, *i.e.* injurious spirits.)

14. *Is all one with the life thereof.* The change brings the passage into harmony with ver. 11, 12; Gen. ix. 4; Deut. xii. 23, the blood being regarded as the seat of the “soul,” or sentient principle (see on Gen. i. 30).

xviii. 18. *To be a rival to her, for to vex her.* Similarly LXX. (γυναῖκα ἐπ’ ἀδελφῇ αὐτῆς οὐ λήψῃ ἀντίζηλον), Seb. Münster (in æmulationem), Gesenius (ita ut zelotypæ

fiant), Ewald,¹ Dillmann. *Vex* follows the rendering of Onkelos (לאַעקא לַה) and the Syriac (ܠܐܥܩܐ ܠܗ), and cannot, perhaps, be said to be actually incorrect, though לַצֵּר is not the form which would have been naturally used to express the simple idea of *vex*; but it misses the special idea which appears to have been associated with the Hebrew word. A comparison of Hebrew with the cognate languages, Arabic and Syriac, shows that in old times, when polygamy was prevalent, a common term was in use among the Semitic peoples to denote the idea of a *rival*- or *fellow-wife*, derived from a root צָר signifying *to injure* or *vex*, Arabic ذَرَّةٌ *darrat-un* = Syriac ܐܪܬܐ *'artâ* = Hebrew צָרָה *Sārâh*.² צָר is here, in all probability, a verb formed from this substantive צָרָה—in the technical language of the grammarians, a “denominative” from it, just as שָׁבַר *to sell corn*, is a denominative from שֶׁבַר *corn*, or אָהַל *to move tent*, from אֹהֶל *tent*, etc.³

¹ *Antiquities* (E.T.), p. 197 (in the German, p. viii.).

² For the Arabic, see Lane's *Arabic Lexicon*, p. 1776; also his translation of the *Thousand and One Nights*, ii. 135 (ed. 1865), where the word occurs. It is used likewise in this passage in the version of Saadyah (“that she may be her *fellow-wife*”). The Hebrew occurs 1 Sam. i. 6, of Peninnah (see R.V. *marg.*), who was at once the “*fellow-wife*” and the “*rival*” of Hannah. The Syriac word occurs in the same passage in the Peshitto; likewise in Ephrem Syrus, I. 84, where Leah speaking says, “Thou hast made me a *fellow-wife* to Rachel's handmaid Bilhah.”

The interchange of consonants is that which is regularly observed between the three languages, where the Hebrew צ corresponds to an Arabic ض; its representative in Aramaic is ܥ; so, for instance, אָרֶץ = אَرْض = אַרְעָא; ܐܪܥܐ. Further examples may be found in the comparative glossaries in Dr. Wright's excellent *Book of Jonah in Four Oriental Versions* (London, 1857); or in the list in the Appendix to the writer's *Hebrew Tenses* (ed. 2, 1881), p. 252 f.

³ So Lagarde, in his *Essay Whether Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister is, or is not, prohibited in the Mosaic Writings*, published originally in the *Göttingen Nachrichten*, 1882, No. 13, and reprinted in the volume entitled *Mittheilungen* (1884), p. 125-134, from which some of the particulars stated above are derived. Keil, following Knobel, derives צָר from צָרַר *to bind* (= צָר not צָרָר—one of the many instances of words, distinguishable in Arabic, being confused in Hebrew), and renders “to pack together,” i.e. to

The rendering "one to another," for *a wife to her sister*, though it still, strange to say, finds advocates, is untenable upon grammatical grounds. The phrase in question, when it bears this idiomatic sense, is preceded by a plural term, either expressed or distinctly implied, *specifying the persons* (or objects) *to which it relates*; thus, "And they parted, each from his brother," or "*the five curtains, one to another*" (Gen. xiii. 11; Exod. xxvi. 3).

xix. 24. *For giving praise.* See Judg. ix. 24, where the Hebrew word (rendered there *festival*, literally "praises") is the same.

xxi. 4, marg. LXX. *on a sudden, i.e.* (probably) כִּבְלֵעַ for בָּעַל as in Num. iv. 10, where the rendering is the same, viz. ἐξάπινα. The Hebrew text is very difficult, and apparently corrupt; בָּעַל has nowhere else the sense either of *chief man* or (standing absolutely) of *husband*.

xxiii. 2. *Set feasts.* The word (מוֹעֵד) means a *stated* or *appointed season* (see marg.), and is wider than חַג (hāg), which denotes a *festival* observed as a pilgrimage (like the annual Mohammedan *haj'* at Mecca), and accompanied with dances or joyous processions (Judg. xxi. 19-21; Isa. xxx. 29), and is rendered in the Revised Version by the simple word *feast*. There were only three *haggim*, or "feasts," observed in the manner described, and marked by the general attendance of the male population at the chief sanctuary (Exod. xxiii. 14-17; Deut. xvi. 1-17), viz. the feasts of Unleavened Bread, Weeks, and Ingathering; but the Sabbath, New Year, and Day of Atonement are included equally in this chapter among the *mō'ādim* or stated seasons. For other examples of the latter word, see Num. x. 10; xv. 13; Isa. i. 14; and, more generally, Gen. i. 14; Ps. civ. 19. In A.V. it was often rendered "solemn feasts" (or assemblies), where "solemn" had the sense of the Latin

unite in one common marriage-tie; but this, for more reasons than one, is not probable.

solemnis, i.e. "stated"; in the R.V., this, being liable now to mislead, has generally been changed; or where the old rendering has been retained, the true sense has been indicated on the margin (*e.g.* Hos. ii. 11; Isa. xxxiii. 20; Lam. i. 4; ii. 6).

xxiii. 3, 24, 32, 39. *Solemn rest*. The Hebrew word is considered to express the idea of deep or complete rest, and is similarly rendered in the other passages of the Priestly Legislation in which it occurs (*e.g.* Exod. xvi. 23; xxxi. 15).

xxv. 33. The text is explained to mean: If one of the Levites redeems the house after it has been sold to a member of another tribe, it shall nevertheless in the jubilee year revert to its original owner; but if this be the sense, it is obscurely expressed, and the pronoun *his* is left without an antecedent. The reading of the Vulgate, given in the margin, makes the passage consistent and clear, and is adopted by Ewald, *Antiquities* (p. 377), Oehler (§ 151. 21), and Dillmann. A.V. (with Rashi and Aben Ezra) evaded the difficulty by giving the Hebrew word נָאֵל (*redeem*), a sense which it never possesses ("purchase").

xxvi. 1. Comp. Num. xxvi. 52.

xxvi. 30. *Sun-images* for *images*. So Isa. xvii. 8; xxvii. 9; Ezek. vi. 4, 6; 2 Chron. xiv. 4; xxxiv. 4, 7. The Heb. is *ḥammān*, from *hammah*, a rare word signifying the sun (Isa. xxx. 26). There is no doubt as to the meaning, though it is not preserved in any of the ancient versions, which render vaguely by words denoting *idol* or *image*. *Ḥammān* is a frequent epithet of Baal, the God of Heaven, in Phœnician inscriptions, especially those found on the site of Carthage, and in other parts of North Africa. The ninety votive tablets found by N. Davis, and now in the British Museum, begin regularly with the words: "To the lady Tanith, the face (*i.e.* manifestation)¹ of Baal, and

¹ Such at least is the common interpretation; cf. the use of פָּנִים in the O.T. See, however, Dillmann in the *Monatsberichte* of the Berlin Academy, 1881, p. 609 f.

to the lord Baal *Ḥammān*. . . .” Others begin: “To the lord Baal *Ḥammān*, because he heard their voice, and blessed them. . . .”¹ Thus in Phœnician the sun-god bore the title of Baal-Ḥammān. And in the inscription on an altar from Palmyra, now at Oxford, the name is applied, as in the O. T., to a figure erected to the sun: “In the month Elul,² of the year 396 (=A.D. 85), this *ḥammān* and this altar were made and dedicated by Lishmash and Zebīda, sons of Malku, son of Yariabel, son of Nesha, who is called son of ‘Abdibel, of the tribe of the children of Migdath, to the Sun (שמש), the god of the house of their father, for its welfare, for their welfare, and for the welfare of their brethren and children.”³

THE BOOK OF NUMBERS.

iv. 20. *Even for a moment*. Lit., while one swallows; apparently a proverbial expression, to be explained from Job vii. 19. LXX. ἐξάπινα. The rendering of A. V. *cover*, though as old as Onkelos and the Syriac version, cannot be defended etymologically, and is probably only conjectured from the context. The word is a common one in the sense of *to swallow* (sometimes metaph. = *destroy*).

vi. 2. *Nazirite*. The word is borrowed directly from the Hebrew, and its proper orthography has been restored.

vii. 89. *The Voice speaking*. The rendering of A. V. (*voice of one speaking*) was ungrammatical.

viii. 11. *On the behalf of*. Hebrew, כִּמְחָה. A. V. *of* was here ambiguous. So iii. 9 (where A. V. had “out of”); Exod. xxvii. 21; Lev. xxiv. 8.

xi. 25. *But did so no more*. Lit., and added not. So LXX., Pesh., Rashi, and Aben Ezra (who illustrates the

¹ See also in the *Corpus*, No. 122-3 (Malta), and No. 138 (Lilybæum).

² = Aug.-Sept. (Neh. vi. 15).

³ See Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, p. 491; or De Vogué, *Syrie Centrale* (1868), p. 73.

expression aptly from Deut. v. 22 [Heb. 19]) and Kimchi. A.V., like Seb. Münster (et non cessaverunt), follows the Vulg. (nec ultra cessaverunt), and Onkelos (ולא פסקיו); but this sense cannot be extracted from the present reading of the Hebrew יִסְפוּ (from יִסְף to add)—nor, indeed, from a presumable vocalization יִסְפוּ (from יִסוף, which would not be used in such a connexion).

xii. 2, 8. *With*. Not אַת, but ב. The construction is unusual, but not unparalleled. See Mr. Cheyne's note on Hosea i. 2 (in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools*), or Ewald's *Hebrew Syntax*, § 217 (3), where the meaning which it most probably expresses is explained.

xiii. 17, 22. *The South*. See on Gen. xii. 9.

33. *Nephilim*. See on Gen. vi. 4.

xviii. 2, 4. *Joined*. The word *yillavu* is the same as in Gen. xxix. 24, and is chosen on account of its assonance with *Levi*: the tribe are to assume the position implied (apparently) in their name. Comp. Micah i. 10, 14, 15; Zeph. ii. 4, where *Aphrah* and the other places mentioned are threatened each with a fate suggested by its name.

xxi. 2-3. *Margins*. See on Deut. vii. 2.

14. *Vaheb in Suphah*. The passage is cited for the purpose of showing that Arnon formed the N. border of Moab: the verb, therefore, is omitted as irrelevant; in the original context some such verb as *we took* must have preceded. *What he did* is not admissible as a rendering of *waheb*. *Wahaba* is the common Arabic word signifying *to give*, but it is used in Hebrew only in the imperative, and could not in any case be translated *did*. The "sea of *suph*," i.e. a particular kind of weed (Isa. xix. 6; Jonah ii. 5), is the usual Hebrew name of the Red Sea: but it is never called *suphah*, which must here either denote the name of a place, or (as the original context is unknown to us) mean *storm* (Isa. xvii. 13, etc.).

30. *Margin*. אֵש (fire) for אֲשֶׁר (which). So LXX.

xxii. 5. *River, i.e.* the Euphrates: see on Gen. xxxi. 21, ("the river of" is against grammar).

36. *The City of Moab, i.e.* the capital, called elsewhere "Ar of Moab" (xxi. 15, 28; Isa. xv. 1).

xxiii. 3. *A bare height.* Quite different from the "high places" of xxii. 41. The word (if the reading here be correct) is an uncommon one, occurring besides only Isa. xli. 18; xlix. 9, and six times in Jeremiah.

xxiv. 3. *Was closed.* Margin, Or, *is opened.* The alternative will strike the reader as remarkable. The fact is, the word is found only here (and ver. 15) in the O. T. (the word in ver. 4 is different), and its meaning is uncertain. The LXX. and Onkelos, rendering *who seeth truly* or *clearly* (ὁ ἀληθινῶς ὁρῶν, דשפיר חזא), appear to have followed the interpretation adopted on the margin, as is done distinctly by the Syriac ("he whose eyes are open"), Saadyah ("the man that is keen of sight"), the mediæval Jewish authorities, Rashi, Aben Ezra, and Kimchi, and among moderns by Gesenius and Ewald. This may be supported by the sense borne by שֵׁתֵם in the Mishna (2nd cent. A.D.), in a passage already quoted by Rashi, where it is used of *piercing* a hole in a cask. The Vulgate, on the other hand, renders *cuius obturatus est oculus*, connecting it apparently with קָתַם, *to stop up* (to which, however, at least in the passage from the Mishna, it is expressly opposed), and this is preferred by Roediger in the Thesaurus, and Keil, on the ground principally that the other sense is tautologous with verse 4^b. (Keil and Roediger, however, both render "*is closed*," understanding the reference to be to the *bodily* eye, closed during the period of prophetic ecstasy, while the mental eye, verse 4^b, remains open; R.V. refers it to the *mental* eye, closed before, but now, under the prophetic inspiration, opened.)

4. *Falling down.* See 1 Sam. xix. 24.

xxiv. 17. *Sons of tumult, i.e.* the warriors of Moab. So

all moderns, guided by the interpretation in Jer. xlviii. 45 *end*—a verse based evidently upon Num. xxi. 28 and this passage;¹ שָׁת being regarded as a contraction for שָׂאֵת, Lam. iii. 47 (“devastation”).

xxv. 3. *Baal-peor*. Doubtless a local Baal, worshipped at Peor, and explained correctly on the margin. So in Phœnician Inscriptions we meet with Baal of Tyre, of Lebanon, of Tarsus, etc. The Greek deities had similarly special local epithets in different localities.

xxxv. 10. *Encampments* (LXX. ἐπαύλεις). See Gen. xxv. 16; Ezek. xxv. 4; 1 Chron. vi. 54 (Heb. 39), where the same rare word occurs. In Syriac, pronounced slightly differently, it is used for a nomad village or fold (אַלְהָ: e.g. John x. 1).

xxxv. 11. *Unwittingly* for *at unawares*. The alteration may appear to be a needless one, but, in fact, two distinct terms occur in the law of homicide, both rendered in A.V. “unawares.” The one which occurs here, בְּשֹׁגְגָה, has been already rendered several times *unwittingly* (chap. xv. 26–29; Lev. iv. 2, 22, &c.). The other, בְּבִלִי דַעַת, occurs Deut. iv. 42; xix. 4, and is now consistently represented by *unawares*. In Josh. xx. 3, 5, 9, the two expressions are used together.

S. R. DRIVER.

CHRIST, THE INTERPRETER OF NATURE.

(MATTHEW vi. 24–34.)

To the filial eye of Jesus Christ the moral world always shone through the natural world and glorified it. He saw all the beauty of Nature; nothing of all its great riches was lost on Him; and in a multitude of parables and other pictorial touches, He has set Nature in her endless

¹ The “crown of the head” is obtained from the word here rendered *break down*, by a slight change in two letters (קִרְקַר for קִרְקַד).

operations and aspects before us. But our Lord could never for a moment rest in Nature, or look on her as an end in herself. To him the whole visible universe was eloquent with meanings and lessons, with reminiscences and presages that ennobled and glorified her, because they came through her from a better world out of which she too had sprung, and for the sake of which she was daily sustained and administered.

The cornfields, the vineyards, the flowers, the birds of the air, the flocks of sheep in the meadows, the sky, the clouds, the times of ploughing and sowing and reaping, the starry nights, and the all-enriching sun—all the powers, provisions, and aspects of Nature were dear and beautiful to Him; and all the more so, that their beauty and beneficence were not their own, but were all so many manifestations of the wisdom and power and goodness of His Father. The sun that rose on the evil and on the good was "His sun;" the rain fell on the just and on the unjust from His windows; His Father fed all the fowls of the air, and clothed all the grasses of the field. Jesus Christ was the only true Minister and Interpreter of Nature she has ever had. He alone fully understood her place and appreciated her plan. He alone could reveal her, and set forth her whole message, because He saw her and rejoiced in her as the manifestation of His Father's wisdom, and the operation of His Father's hands. How different was Christ's enjoyment of Nature from much of our modern worship of her! How many in our day stand among the vast processes, and most majestic scenes of Nature, how many delight and make us to delight in watching her adaptations and harmonies, without one thought of Almighty God, whose message of truth and gift of beauty all this is! Nay, it has become a mark and token of the finest art and the truest science that they are to be without God, both in their methods and in their lessons. The truest

esthetic is to be atheistic; and the exactest science is to deny design and causation, and know only sequences and phenomena.

The unfilial and indevout love of Nature may, in some ways, and to a certain depth, refine the mind and beautify the life of the philosopher or the artist, but it has no power at all to make him a moral man, much less a holy. Jonathan Edwards, in his incomparable work on the Religious Affections, connects, as only a devout and a master mind could, the esthetic and artistic delight that is felt in the contemplation of beautiful objects, with the far nobler delight that is felt in the beauty of holiness. And he argues that the original beauty of Nature and the secondary beauty of objects of art would all immediately suggest and lead on to the more exquisite and stately and fruitful beauty of the moral and spiritual world, were it not that men are alienated from God and His holiness in a way they are not from Nature and her beauty. And no wonder; for Nature does not humiliate and condemn and slay her students as the spiritual world always does. A man may be a devotee of Nature and remain under the dominion of evil passions, and cruel and unclean affections; but the seekers after the beauty of holiness seek and find that at their peril and to their shame, as their histories and their works universally testify. "Woe is me, for I am undone," cries one of them, "because I am a man of unclean lips . . . for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts." "Depart from me," cries another, "for I am a sinful man, O Lord." And another, when he saw the King in His beauty, fell at His feet as dead.

I suppose the beasts of the field see the greenness of the grass and the lustre of the flowers among which they feed their fill and lie down to rest. I suppose the eagle also sees the vast landscape over which he sails; but no one supposes that the brute cattle have any knowledge or

enjoyment of the beauty amid which they browse, or that a ravenous bird is at all tamed by being bathed daily in the glorious sunlight. They have no eye wherewith to see the beauty of earth and sea and sky; Nature has no revelation of that kind to make to them. And there are too many men who are as beasts are before the beauty of Nature: they have eyes, but they see not; and ears, but they hear not. There are other men, again, who are entranced and enraptured with the glory of creation, but who are all the time as dead as a stone to the glory of God. His "invisible things" were clearly seen by the Psalmists and the Prophets, and by Jesus Christ His Son. But to many in our day and land, with shame and fear be it said, the eternal power and Godhead of the Creator are not understood by the things He hath made. Men otherwise learned and open to truth, have in this thing become vain in their imaginations; and while professing to be wise have become fools. They are as dead to the presence and power of God in the works of creation, as their grosser-hearted fellows are to the beauty of a landscape, the raiment of a lily, or the glory of a starry sky.

Science and art may thus be most unprofitable and unblessed to those who pursue them as a chief end and a final and self-sufficing object. Art will be felt to be barren; and science, with all her wealth of secular fruits, will seem smitten with sterility to a wise man when she does not sound abroad and illustrate the greatness and the goodness and the beauty of God. Nature in her noblest aspects is but the threshold and floor of the heavenly temple; and art in all her many departments is best employed when used to adorn its windows and illustrate its walls. But he is surely a poor worshipper whose heart never rises above the pavement; and whose adoration is exhausted on the handicraft, on the furnishings and fittings and ornaments of the sacred house. Nature

is great and manifold, but her God is greater. Art is sweet, but his worship is sweeter far. The creation is an endless cause of wonder and praise to those who search it out, but the beauty and blessedness of holiness is their very life.

In the first place, then, we see an excellent illustration of the filial enjoyment and religious use of Nature in these words of the Creator's incarnate Son: "Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Consider also the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: and yet I say unto you, That even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these."

But the immediate aim of Christ in this most exquisite passage is to lead us all to trust ourselves and all that concerns us to the Fatherly providence of Almighty God. These cabinet-pictures of animate and inanimate nature are not works of pure art, that is to say, they are not pure art in the sense of being without practical application to the needs and wants of men. They are as beautiful as if they stood here for their beauty alone; and they are as useful, as instructive, and as full of moral ends, as if they were barren of every other quality. We are so limited in our gifts and in our scope, that we have often to shut out all thought of use when we aim at a perfect work of art; just as, on the other hand, we are often compelled to neglect the pursuit of beauty when we are bent on utility. But both Nature and Art, with the language that best exhibits them, are all plastic and harmonious in the hands of Jesus Christ. He is not instructive at the expense of beauty; nor, when most beautiful in His words and works, is He less rich to those who sit at His feet.

Pointing in the most perfect words to the fowls of the air as they are fed from the hand of God, and then at the lilies of the field as they outshine Solomon in all his glory, our

Lord says to us, So, only in better ways, does your Heavenly Father care for, and take all needful thought for you. Leave then all your over-thoughtfulness and anxiety to Him; He alone can fulfil all your thoughts, and without anxiety make them good. Torture not yourselves with what is above your strength and beyond your scope. Take all thought for that part in your life and in His providence which He has appointed you. Do your daily task with all fervour and fidelity, but after your allotted thought has been taken and your appointed part accomplished, leave the issue with Him who holds all issues in His own hand. Plough your field to its utmost furrow; sow your seed with a liberal hand, and when the harvest comes put in the sickle and store up the hundredfold fruits. Sow your seed with all thoughtfulness in the seedtime, and leave it without more thought till the harvest. With the sowing of the seed your work is for the time done. Take your well-earned rest, and thus you will be the more ready for the arduous labours of the harvest. Do not wade about among the sprouting corn as if your restless feet would make the blade fill better, or the shock ripen sooner. The plough, and the seed-basket, and the sickle, and the threshing instrument, and the winnowing fan are all yours to make use of with all due thought and care, each at its proper season; but the former and the latter rains, the filling sun and the mellowing winds are all in your Father's hand. "I have planted," said Paul, "and Apollos watered; but God gave the increase." Leave then your husbandry in His hands also. Take you no thought where He takes all.

Nor are our Heavenly Father's providences toward us exhausted in providing us with food and raiment. It is not we that say first of ourselves that we need more than meat. It is God and His Son who thus enhance and exalt our estimate of ourselves. It is Christ who says, after having spoken so beautifully about the fowls of the air, "Are ye not

much better than they?" Yes; much better, in this at least, that we need much more help and attention than they. For long after we have found the right answer to the anxious question "What shall we eat? and what shall we drink? and wherewithal shall we be clothed?" there arises a whole world of anxious thoughts, of infinitely more moment than the thought of food or raiment. Thoughts about our work; thoughts about our children; thoughts about the Church and the cause of Christ so bound up with her as we think; thoughts in thousands about our life till death, our prospects in death, and our deserts and destinies after it. Now in this and in many other kindred scriptures Christ gathers up all these overwhelming thoughts, and brings them all under this wide and blessed law of our heavenly Father's love and care. Leaving, then, one class of issues in God's hand, leave all. Leave the life of the body, and leave with it the life of the soul; leaving the time to come, leave also the time past; and leaving time past and time to come, leave your immortal soul when time shall be no longer. In a word, "Be careful for nothing; but in everything by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God. And the peace of God which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus."

"The words of the wise are as goads, and as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies." And both as goad to spur on our slow faith, and as a nail fastened so as to rivet the truth He has taught, this wisest of masters adds: "Let the morrow take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." That is to say, you will have enough every present day to occupy your thoughts and employ your hands though you let to-morrow's troubles alone. Let each day deal with its own duties and cares and leave to-morrow's duties and cares to to-morrow's strength. Take the ills of life, not in battalions,

but as single foes. Thus meeting them you may, with a steady bravery, conquer them ; but if you call them all up and challenge them all at once, you will be drowned in a sea of troubles. Deal with the ills of life as the Roman hero dealt with the three brothers who set upon him in full armour. Seeing them all rushing on him at the same moment, and knowing that he could not stand up under the threefold onset, he turned and fled for a space before them ; when, looking back, he saw one of his pursuers ahead of the others ; then, turning suddenly, he slew him, and again fled ; after a time turning suddenly again he slew the second, and, standing over his dead body, he waited in confidence the approach of the last of his foes. So do you fight life's sore battle, taking one enemy at a time. God has divided your life into days, with the rest and repose of intervening nights, and He has spread the ills of life over many days. Meet your ills so. Divide and conquer. Sufficient for each day is the evil thereof.

But the best thing in this rich and beautiful passage, and the thing to which it all leads up, is yet to come, and it comes in these noble and inspiring words : " But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness." Having taught and illustrated in the happiest and wisest way the religious observation and use of Nature, and having by means of Nature risen above Nature and entered the all-embracing economy of Divine Providence, Christ now comes to that for which both Nature and Providence exist and operate, namely, for man, and for his pursuit and possession of righteousness. This is the end, this is the goal, this is the crown of all. He has already warned His disciples in never-to-be-forgotten words that their righteousness must far exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees ; must indeed be a righteousness of another kind and quality altogether. Seek first, He would say, the solid righteousness of the ten commandments. " Think

not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." Then seek the yet more spiritual righteousness of this sermon I am now preaching unto you. And if there be any other righteousness yet to be revealed, God will ere long open up and make offer of that also unto you. Sufficient for the Sermon on the Mount is the righteousness thereof.

These hortatory words, "Seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness" are, so to speak, the application of the second head of the Sermon on the Mount. The final and most solemn appeal will come, in due time, at the close of the third head. But meantime, having set the righteousness of His kingdom before His hearers, our Lord here tarries in His discourse for a moment, and with His utmost urgency exhorts them to seek it with paramount care and resolution. And these, according to this great sermon, are some of the chief things that enter into all true righteousness: poverty of spirit; meekness of mind; mercifulness, and the love of peace; reconciliation, instant and entire reconciliation with an offended brother; a clean heart, again and again returned upon, and a clean eye, and these at the expense of any pain or self-denial; uttermost integrity and simplicity of speech; absence of all retaliation, even to our greatest enemy; the most generous treatment of those who look to us for help; with an utter abhorrence of all ostentation and self-exhibition in our good works and our worship; and in all and above all, and repeatedly enforced, a single eye, and a right intention. Let this noble ideal of a disciple's life be found in all of you. Seek it always; seek it first; seek it like meat and drink; and it is Christ's promise and engagement that at last—it may be long, but wait and hunger for it—at last it will come, and then you shall be for ever filled with it. "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled."

ALEXANDER WHYTE.

RECENT ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THERE is, I regret to say, but little to notice in this department.

Dr Edersheim's *Warburtonian Lectures*¹ are devoted to proving that Christianity was the true unfolding and fulfilment of the Old Testament, and not a natural upgrowth out of the ideas or the circumstances of the age. Lecture I. states the question generally, and shows how Christianity in its origin appealed to a great Messianic expectation, the source of which can be found nowhere but in the Old Testament. Lecture II. maintains that this expectation was not based on a false or fanciful interpretation of the Old Testament, and contains some important remarks on the relation of prophecy to fulfilment, which is more fully discussed in Lecture IV. A brief quotation will indicate the writer's view.

"Prophecy can only be properly understood from the standpoint of fulfilment; prophecy always starts from historical *data* in the then present; and the fulfilment in each case not only covers but is wider than the mere letter of the prophecy." Hence "prophecy is not predicted history; . . . it had always a present meaning and present lessons to those who heard it; and as this meaning unfolded in the course of history, it conveyed to each succeeding generation something new, bringing to each fresh present lessons" (p. 37). Lecture V. discusses the moral element in Old Testament prophecy, and the features which distinguish it from heathen divination; and Lecture VI. treats of its progressive character, and the spiritual element in it.

Lectures VII. and VIII. discuss recent theories of the origin of the Pentateuch and the relation of the Law to the Prophets. The difficulties which Wellhausen's hypothesis involves are examined, and in defence of the traditional view the history of Israel is reviewed, with the object of showing that the circumstances of the people account in great measure for the non-observance of many of the Mosaic ordinances, and that traces of the observance of some of them are to be found, though ignored by modern critics.

¹ *Prophecy and History in Relation to The Messiah: the Warburton Lectures for 1880-1884, with two Appendices on the Arrangement, Analysis, and Recent Criticism of the Pentateuch.* By Alfred Edersheim, M.A. Oxon., D.D., Ph D., Author of *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1885.

In the remaining lectures the Messianic ideas of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigraphic writings are investigated, and the last stage of Messianic prophecy—the testimony of the Baptist—is examined.

Dr. Edersheim feels strongly that if Wellhausen's theory, with all that it implies, were true, "it would seem logically impossible to maintain the claims of Christ as the Old Testament Messiah of Moses and the Prophets, and the Son of David." But that theory must, as he goes on to say, "be examined on its own merits, irrespective of preconceived opinions or possible consequences." No doubt, if it can be proved, we must wholly recast our view of the Messianic preparation; but it is surely a mistake to say that the reality of that preparation would be disproved. There certainly are students who find it possible to accept that theory without abandoning their belief that Jesus is the Messiah, and that the Old Testament records the Divine preparation for His advent.

The work has suffered from the nature of its origin. A series of lectures spread over four years is certain to be unequal in proportion and somewhat desultory, unless the plan has been very carefully laid out beforehand. The author is sensible of this, and apologises for it in the preface; but it is a pity that he did not see his way to rewriting a considerable part of the lectures for publication.

Appendix II. ("Analysis of the Pentateuch and its Criticism") should have been helpful to the general reader, but is so condensed as to be almost unintelligible, if not actually misleading. The book ought to have been more accurately revised. *Josh.* viii. (p. 212) for *Jud.* viii. will do no harm, but the misprint 1855 (for 1835) as the date of the publication of the works of Vatke and George is serious (p. 202, note 2), and "the common quotation, *Magna est veritas, et prævalebunt*" (p. 313, note 1) should have been correctly given. For *Isaac Israeli in the tenth century* (p. 192, note 2) read *Isaac ben Jasus in the eleventh century*. See the second edition of Zöckler's *Handbuch*, p. 133.

The general character of the *Pulpit Commentary* is already well known, and it is only necessary to mention the appearance of a new volume, containing the remainder of Jeremiah (chaps. xxx.-lii.), and the Lamentations.¹ Dr. Cheyne's name is sufficient guarantee

¹ The *Pulpit Commentary*, edited by Rev. Canon H. D. M. Spence, M.A., and

for the excellence of the Exposition, though the nature of the work and the limits of space allowed impose somewhat serious restrictions. The note on Jer. xvi. 13 contains a good example of the way in which fresh light is continually being thrown on the Old Testament by the decipherment of inscriptions. The prophecy is discussed on the assumption that there is no certain historical evidence of a conquest of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar. A postscript however is added, to say that the note is left as it was originally written in February, 1881 (it is surely rather hard upon an author that the publication of his work should be so long delayed) "in ignorance of Wiedemann's then recent discovery of a contemporary hieroglyphic inscription, which, as the report of the German Oriental Society expresses it, 'ratifies the hitherto universally doubted fact of an invasion of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar.' The hieroglyphic narrative is supplemented and confirmed by two cuneiform records," of which the substance is given.

Dr. Cheyne's Introduction to the Lamentations, though brief, is very interesting. He assigns the book to three authors at least, belonging to the same "school of elegiac poets," but "no part of it was written by Jeremiah." Jeremiah however "was probably the favourite book of these poets (next to the Psalter, so far as this book was in existence); and so, if a title must be given by way of defining the authorship, we might perhaps style the entire book, on the analogy of a portion of the Psalter, 'The Book of the Lamentations of the Sons of Jeremiah.'"

The "Homiletics" and "Homilies" contain an abundance of material for sermons. It is to be hoped that they will be used with judgment, and not made a substitute for the careful study of the text.

Professor Sayce has given us in a brief compass an excellent introduction to Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther,¹ the distinguishing feature of which is, as will be expected, the use made of recent monumental discoveries, more especially of the inscriptions of Cyrus. Readers of Dr. Cheyne's *Isaiah* will be already prepared for the new view of the origin, beliefs, and policy of Cyrus, which

Rev. J. S. Exell, M.A. "*Jeremiah*": Exposition by Rev. T. K. Cheyne, M.A., D.D.; Homiletics, by Rev. W. F. Adeney, M.A., etc. "*Lamentations*": Exposition by Rev. T. K. Cheyne; Homiletics, by Rev. W. F. Adeney, etc.

¹ *An Introduction to the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther.* By A. H. Sayce, M.A., Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology at Oxford. London: The Religious Tract Society. 1885.

is forced upon us by the decipherment of his inscriptions. Cyrus, though of Persian descent, was an Elamite, and did not become king of Persia till after B.C. 549; he was not a monotheist, but "a polytheist who worshipped Bel-Merodach and Nebo, and paid public homage to the deities of Babylon"; his restoration of the Jews was not a special act of favour to them, but part of a policy of conciliation towards the conquered populations which had been deported from their homes.

Differing from many modern critics, Professor Sayce thinks that the Book of Ezra was compiled by Ezra himself, about B.C. 457; the Book of Nehemiah, as is generally admitted, was written partly (chaps. i.-vii., xi.-xii. 26 in part, xii. 27-xiii.) by Nehemiah himself, about B.C. 430, partly by a later hand.

Very interesting are the remarks on the way in which Aramaic became the language of trade, and superseded Hebrew, and upon the Babylonian and Persian words in Ezra and Nehemiah.

The problems of the Book of Esther are excellently treated. The very late date assigned to the book by some critics—Zunz and Reuss place it in the post-Maccabæan age—is rejected, and its composition is placed towards the end of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus (B.C. 425). The author must have lived in Persia, before the overthrow of the Persian power. The historical credibility of the book is defended, and the striking contrast between the Hebrew book and the anachronisms and exaggerations of the apocryphal additions, is well brought out.

The Book of Esther was omitted from the canon by Melito of Sardis and Gregory of Nazianzus (how came Professor Sayce to make such a slip as "*of Nazianzen*"?), and Luther wished it had perished; but, as Professor Sayce well concludes:

"The Book of Esther affords a useful illustration of a fact which is often forgotten. God's inspiration is not confined to a particular kind of literary work or a particular description of narrative. Holy Scripture contains examples of almost every sort of literary composition; all alike are consecrated in it. . . . Like the Song of Songs or the Book of Ecclesiastes, it teaches us the lesson that St. Peter had to learn: 'Nothing that God hath cleansed is common or unclean.'"

A. F. KIRKPATRICK.

BREVIA.

Schrader's Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament.¹—It has been a matter of great surprise to us for some years past, that no English publisher has thought it worth while to produce an English version of Dr. Schrader's *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*. When the first German edition appeared in 1872, a rush was made for it from all quarters, and the result was that in a very short time the copies were all sold and quite unobtainable. About ten years elapsed before Dr. Schrader saw his way to giving a second and enlarged edition to the world; when this actually appeared in 1882, the scholar was delighted to see that the book had become almost doubled in thickness. And no wonder need be felt that the book had become so large; for during those ten years the science of Assyriology had consolidated itself, had expanded its range of action, and had made its importance felt in every branch of Semitic and Biblical learning. Only a few years ago the results announced by the Assyriologists were received with positive unbelief by the greater portion of the literary and religious world; and even those who felt disposed to give every branch of learning a chance in the struggle for existence, looked askance at the helpless infant Assyriology in its cradle. When Dr. Schrader published his first edition of the *Keilinschriften*, he was one of the six or seven men in Europe who had given any real attention to the subject of the cuneiform inscriptions, or who perceived their true value. Sir Henry Rawlinson, Prof. A. H. Sayce, Mr. George Smith, Dr. Hincks and Mr. Edwin Norris represented the students of England; Dr. Oppert and M. Lenormant those of France; while in Germany Dr. Schrader stood alone. The literature of Assyriology in those days was very scanty, and students were entirely dependent upon the three volumes of *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, published by Sir Henry Rawlinson, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Norris for the Trustees of the British Museum. Very few texts had been translated, and the translators openly avowed that their work was only tentative. The longest texts that had been done into English

¹ *The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, by E. Schrader. Translated from the second enlarged German edition, by O. C. Whitehouse. Vol. i Williams & Norgate.

were those of Tiglath-Pileser I., B.C. 1120, and Assurbanipal, B.C. 668; the former containing eleven hundred short lines of Assyrian text. Mr. Norris had commenced to make an Assyrian Dictionary; but this latter work was begun on too large a scale, and only three volumes of it were published; these, however, form a marvellous monument of the industry and ability of their writer, for the student may consult these volumes with advantage to this day. In this dark and very early dawn of the day of Assyriology, Dr. Schrader conceived the idea of collecting from the cuneiform inscriptions all the evidence that could be made of use in explaining, supporting, or proving the statements of the books of the Bible. It was a grand idea, and one, which to work out, required incessant labour, a knowledge of the collateral languages of the Assyrian group, and an acquaintance with the history of their peoples. Nothing daunted by the paucity of material, Dr. Schrader made the best use of what he had, and published his little book. It was at once apparent how great was the importance of the newly discovered reading of the Assyrian language to the historian, antiquary and theologian, but more particularly to the last. From that time forward books on Assyrian multiplied. The Society of Biblical Archæology published copies of important Assyrian texts with translations; Mr. Smith published his *Eponym Canon*, a book of the greatest importance for Assyrian chronology *Assyrian Discoveries*; and the *Chaldean Genesis*; and in 1875 an era was marked in Assyrian studies by the publication of an *Assyrian Grammar*, with a full syllabary in Assyrian type, by Rev. A. H. Sayce. It must not be imagined that the French students were idle; on the contrary, MM. Oppert, Menant, and Lenormant, with the greatest diligence, published several works, each adding some new fact to those already known. Each year saw some new and important publication; and each year saw the domain of Assyrian knowledge extending more and more. Amid all this activity, Dr. Schrader was comparing, making notes, and ripening his conclusions on Assyrian and Biblical matters; gleaning ideas and information that would be of use in a new edition of his *Keilinschriften*. Those who are in any way acquainted with the labour such work entails, will readily appreciate Dr. Schrader's industry and perseverance. In addition to this he was preparing for publication his masterly work, *Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung*, a book dedicated to the elucidation of Assyrian geography, and the

scholarly treatise on Assyrian grammar which was published in the *Zeitschrift* of the German Oriental Society.

In 1882, then, the second edition of the *Keilinschriften* appeared. On studying this work one found that every book, "paper," and publication on Assyrian matters of importance had been consulted, and in many cases used; and that the work had really been brought up to the level of Assyrian scholarship of that time. The book appealed more to the specialist and scholar than to the general reader, and the fact that there was no English translation excluded its beneficial and learned influence from the library of many an English student and seeker after truth. Dr. Schrader's plan is to begin at the beginning of the Bible, and taking verse by verse to add all the proofs, or confirmations of it, that he has been able to gather from the cuneiform inscriptions. His authorities he gives at the foot of the page, hence the reader or student is able to control the statements made. The earlier part of the work, containing the elucidations and explanatory notes on Genesis, is that which will appear of the most importance to the reader. Almost every line of the simple but majestic account of the creation as recorded in Genesis has its counterpart in the Assyrian legends. The awful chaos waiting for the Divine mandate which would give light and order, the creation of light and the luminaries, the establishment of the brute creation and the trees, all these things are described in a manner that makes us feel that we are only reading a different version of the account of the creation of the world which was the common property of the Semitic race. When Abraham migrated from his fatherland, he carried all these traditions with him. His God, El-Shaddai, led and directed him, and it has long since been pointed out that this name for the Deity is of Babylonian origin. The stories of the fall, of the cherubim who guarded Paradise, and many others, have, it appears to us, been based upon the ideas of the ancient dwellers of Mesopotamia, from whom Abraham sprung. The account of the wickedness of man, of the determination of the gods to destroy him from off the face of the earth, of the ark, of the saving of the "chosen few," of the total destruction of all other living creatures, and of Noah's sacrifice to God on the damp soil of the "new earth," have all faithful counterparts in the narratives read upon the clay tablets of Assurbanipal's library. In future days, when other Babylonian and Assyrian libraries have been found and their contents studied,

we shall be able to fix a date for the composition of these works, but at present it is impossible. Dr. Schrader's book, apart from its special information, is full of excellent suggestions and thoughtful theories in respect of Bible difficulties. His learning enables him to state these with authority; and his sober sense entitles them to serious consideration, and much deference. His readers will also much appreciate the map by Dr. Kiepert at the beginning of the volume, for it is based on the authority of the cuneiform inscriptions. So far as we have seen, the English translation has been well and carefully done: the sense of the original has been well preserved and Dr. Schrader is very fortunate in that his book has fallen into the hands of a translator so learned and sympathetic. The "prefatory remarks" which the Rev. O. C. Whitehouse has added to his translation, are excellent; and we congratulate him on the successful completion of the first part of a difficult task. It is to be hoped that in its English guise, Dr. Schrader's careful and learned book may find its way into the hands of Bible students of all denominations. And we trust that the example of this German scholar and divine may emulate others to follow in his footsteps, and continue the good work which he has so ably begun.

E.

THE SURVEY OF WESTERN PALESTINE.

THE writer gladly accepts the invitation of the Editor of the EXPOSITOR to express his judgment of the results of the labours of the English Palestine Exploration Society. He thinks it right however, in the following pages, not only to acknowledge the unquestionably great services which have been rendered by the work of this Society, but also to set forth clearly the imperfections and shortcomings, which are in part to be ascribed to the method adopted. A general review of the publications of the English Palestine Society is all the more appropriate now that its activity has extended over twenty years.

With the history of the Survey it may fairly be assumed that our readers are already acquainted. It is sufficient to recall names like those of Wilson, Warren, Drake, Conder and Kitchener. While the first of these distinguished themselves chiefly in connexion with the first expedition sent out by the Society, and in the excavations in Jerusalem (1867), it has, thanks to the indefatigable energy of the last-named engineers, been practicable in seven years not only to carry to completion the great task of the trigonometrical survey of Palestine west of the Jordan, but also to publish the results. Not less cordial recognition is due to the men who, like Besant for example, have in England devoted much time and strength to make these achievements possible.

A series of sumptuous publications has been put forth in this period of twenty years, works which I here need only to mention, such as *The Recovery*, and *Our Work in Palestine*.

Since April, 1, 1869, the Society has had in the *Quarterly Statements*, its own organ. The crown of these publications is, naturally, the great map in twenty-six sheets, and the seven volumes of accompanying Memoirs. To the volume which treats of Jerusalem belongs an atlas with many plans. Maps on a reduced scale have also been published,—a map for the Geography of the Old Testament, and one of Palestine in the New Testament Times. Other works have at least been supported by the patronage of the Society, and put within the reach of its members. Of these I would name in the first place the excellent Introduction of Trelawney Saunders; only in the second rank, various works of Conder. Most recently we have Hull's book on the Geology of the regions adjacent to Palestine on its southern border.

The map with the Memoirs is beyond question the most important of the works hitherto published. That in it an immense advance has been made is self-evident. Any one who will compare the new map with the older ones, for example with Van de Velde, will see at once that we now have a map of Palestine west of the Jordan, which might well take its place beside many of the General Staff maps of European countries. Of course the exact triangulation conducted by engineers could not fail to give very different results from what had previously been set down on maps of Palestine. Yet some of the differences between the new map and the last large map of those regions which has appeared—that of Guérin—are certainly striking. Guérin's trustworthiness is apparent from the whole way in which he gives account of his journey. Throughout he describes only places and ruins which he had himself visited. If we compare, for example, what appears on Sheet II. of the English map, somewhat south of the point where the Lītānī (or el-Kāsimīye) bends to the west, we see at once that the position of "et Taiyibeh," (G. "Thayibeh") rela-

tively to "Deir es Suriân," (G. "Deir Sirian") "Kh. Râj" and "'Alman" (G. "Kh. Radj" and "Kh. A'lmin") is widely different on the two maps. The question also arises at once, whether "Deir Sira," which on Guérin's map is inserted west of "A'tchit" (*Survey*, "'Atshis" west of "et Taiyibeh"), really exists, since it is not on the English map. As a rule the latter has naturally a far larger number of names, yet the cases in which Guérin gives data not found in it are not altogether rare, and are worth closer investigation. A further point of superiority in Guérin is the distinctness of the lettering on his map. The illegibleness of many names on the English map results indeed from the character of the process employed in its production — photozincography — and was scarcely to be avoided. The reduced special edition illustrating the natural drainage and the mountain ranges, which is beautifully clear and compact, is to be regarded as a peculiarly valuable supplement to the great map.

The seven volumes of the *Memoirs* form the necessary commentary to the map. It will be readily understood that these also contain an extraordinary amount of new material; especially to be mentioned are the detail plans which are contained in them. The notes made on the spot by Conder and Kitchener, found chiefly in the three volumes treating of the twenty-six sheets, contain many apt remarks, and fresh, telling descriptions. This text has been enlarged, partly from the *Statements*, partly from other works, such as Conder's *Tent Work*, and Guérin's great *Déscription*. It appears to us, indeed, that in this particular the Editors have done rather more than necessary. Renan's *Phénicie* is a book which every one who means to study Northern Palestine must have at hand; Robinson's and Guérin's works are indispensable to every student of the geography of Palestine. If, on the other hand, the aim were a formal Geographical Encyclopædia, at least an

immensely greater number of references should have been given than is at present the case.

To supplement these three volumes comes the fourth, containing the Name List. Important and valuable as the alphabetical enumeration of the proper names on each sheet is, we cannot but regret that this material was not worked into the first three volumes, with a general index at the end. The latter was explicitly promised, and would materially enhance the value of the whole, by saving much tiresome searching. Practical considerations may have led the committee of the Exploration Fund to adopt their present decidedly inconvenient distribution of the material, but we should greatly deplore it if the idea of a general index were given up. Without such an index the Memoirs are a handsome work for the library table, but not easy for a scholar to use.

In the volumes of which we have already spoken, the contents of the earlier *Statements*—now, in part, out of print—have been incorporated. So, too, the volume which is devoted to Jerusalem, is a recapitulation of earlier publications. Of the articles reprinted from the *Statements* in this volume, as well as in that entitled *Special Papers*, some might perhaps without loss have been omitted or abridged; a number of others might have been much more thoroughly recast. It would have been well, for example, to insert an entirely new article on the Siloam inscription. But we shall not quarrel with what has been done. As the *Quarterly Statements* have but a limited circulation, particularly abroad, we may now make up our minds to procure the whole, although, for private purchasers, it is undoubtedly very costly. Here again it might be asked whether, by abridgment and economy of space, it might not have been possible to produce a work of less external magnificence? Twenty guineas is for many scholars who would be glad to occupy themselves with Palestine studies,

far too high a price; by which I do not mean to say that the work in its present form is too dear at that price.

The volume which, we must frankly confess, is to us the least satisfactory, is that one of the Memoirs which yet remains to be mentioned—upon the Fauna and Flora of Palestine. Instead of this we should have expected a comprehensive treatise on the Physical Geography of Palestine in general, such as naturally belongs to a work which marks the end of a period in the history of Palestine Exploration. Even if the detailed Report upon the Geology had to be reserved for a future occasion, a thorough preliminary sketch would have been valuable. Still more do we miss the whole subject of Climatology, which belongs to the department of Natural History, and upon which Chaplin furnished, in the *Statements* for 1883, one of the best articles which has ever appeared in that magazine. The chapter on Water Supply should also have found a place here, for the meagre remarks upon this subject which are found in *Special Papers*, p. 196, are hardly of a scientific character.

Apart from the really very pretty pictures of certain animals, which particularly recommend this volume also for the drawing-room table, there is perhaps some new matter in Tristram's treatise on the Fauna; unfortunately almost all the Hebrew and Arabic names are deformed by errors in the printing or the writing, and the difficulties which in many cases stand in the way of a Biblical Zoology are not perceived. According to the competent judgment of a professional botanist at our side, the list of plants is a compilation, such as a layman in botany might make, principally from Boissier's *Flora Orientalis*, with the help of some other lists, especially for the monocotyledons, which had not yet appeared in Boissier. It is all carefully done, but is without any particular value, inasmuch as in the case of new and newly distinguished forms no

exact characteristic description is given; frequently even the habitat is missing (*e.g.* p. 210, No. 36; 211, No. 40). Notes of interrogation without the name of the species (*cf.* p. 441, No. 13; 442, No. 19, 23) should be dropped entirely. An inaccuracy of a different kind is the introduction of the same plant under two different names; so, for example, *Scirpus holoschaenus*, p. 438, No. 18, and *Scirpus Australis*, *ibid.* No. 22, are quite synonymous, or at least cannot properly be introduced as two varieties, with two or three entirely different ones between them. It would have much more adequately corresponded to the aim of the work if, instead of this catalogue, there had been given a selection of characteristic forms, with physiognomic and biological descriptions, and a diagnostic of *new* forms, prepared by a professional botanist; finally, a more thorough treatise on the botanical geography of Palestine in general.

It is undoubtedly true that the Memoirs, even in their present form, contain much that is good, and that, by reason of the new material which they afford, they will continue for decades to be the standard work from which Palestine research must set out. The criticisms we make are meant, on the one hand, to express our regret that the work is not still better, and on the other, to indicate the directions in which it seems to us essential that the task should be taken in hand again. This applies especially to what follows.

It is the indubitable merit of the Exploration Society to have made of Palestine research a new special branch of science, and, so far as can be inferred from the liberal contributions of money for its purposes, to have roused a great interest in it. In this very general interest, however, plainly lies a great danger. We German scholars may be accused of being heavy and unpractical, but we are in general of the opinion that a science, if it is to flourish as it ought, needs a right long time, and that it will in the end

be all the more vigorous the longer it remains, so to speak, under ground, in the esoteric circle of special students. In Germany we are still, as regards the geography of Palestine, in this happy period of development. The consequence is that Palestine studies are cultivated by men who are quite as well aware as the English investigators of the close connection of this specialty with the scientific interpretation of the Bible, but who have at the same time the historical, critical, and philological preparation which is necessary to successful labour. It is, in our view, an essential point that Palestine research remain in the closest contact with these other branches of study. This must indeed make it difficult suddenly to achieve important results; and, in fact, it is our conviction that in this field we are by no means as far advanced as it would appear from the *Memoirs*, *Quarterly Statements*, the works of Conder, etc. Of the latter, we refer here particularly to the *Tent Work*, *Handbook for the Bible*, and the recently published *Primer*. In all these the matter is essentially the same; and the more popular the form, the greater the assurance and positiveness with which it is inculcated. We must frankly confess that before these books could pass with us for scientific, we must first have the proofs for the historical presumptions on which they rest.

We have a right to demand that a scholar who writes on the Geography of Palestine, shall first have made himself thoroughly familiar with the problems and results of Old Testament criticism. Only then can he form a judgment concerning the real history of Israel. In our opinion, at least, it is unjustifiable to assume without further investigation that the list of stations in the wandering in the wilderness is the work of Moses; or the statistics of the division of the land, of Joshua. One who writes on these subjects has first of all to show his warrant for ignoring all the results of modern criticism. Conder has

justly called attention to the fact that the description of the boundaries of Ephraim is essentially different from that of the boundaries of Judah, and of the northern tribes. The key to the solution of this enigma is given by criticism, which proves that the accounts come from different sources. In our view an Old Testament map with the tribal boundaries, such as the Palestine Exploration Fund has published, cannot be constructed; inasmuch as, in the first place, the boundaries of the several tribes in many cases run into one another, and were constantly changing; but above all, because the ideal division of the land is sharply to be distinguished from actual possession. To this ideal division belong the data concerning the Levitical cities, which we have in only one,—and that in our judgment a very late—source. The right with which the Levitical cities are introduced into the Old Testament map, and indeed for a very early period, must first be demonstrated. So also in regard to the Moriah question, now so much discussed in the Statements, we miss all acquaintance with the critical literature, and indeed with recent German studies altogether.

Naturally I have no intention of pressing our ideas upon men who do not share our historical and critical views, or who have never concerned themselves with these questions; on the other hand, it is our duty to enter protest against historical conclusions which are drawn from that sort of Palestine geography, to point out other possibilities, and to demand that the controversy be carried on with scientific arguments. Otherwise, English Palestine research, by its apologetic tendency, runs the risk of failing to secure recognition as a complete international science.

Non omnia possumus omnes, is certainly true in this case. We have gratefully acknowledged that rich materials have been made accessible to us by the Exploration Fund; let us hope that its receipts may enable it to carry out many more

surveys, detailed investigations, and excavations! Only let us express the wish that the discussion concerning these materials may be conducted in a more critical, that is, in a more scientific way than heretofore. No one can fairly demand of an engineer, however expert in his profession, that he shall be acquainted with the scientific problems of Old Testament study, for example, or in the historical field in general. It cannot but make a very painful impression on a serious German scholar when Conder, following a prevailing fashion, instructs Sunday-school scholars, in his *Primer*, that the earliest inhabitants of Canaan were Turanians (p. 31), and that the Accadians were akin to the Mongols. In his *Tent Work* (I. 43) he returns to the long since abandoned idea that the Nestorians are descendants of the Ten Tribes. He knows that the Phœnicians came from Mesopotamia (*sic*), and so on. The question concerning the origin and settlements of the Canaanites is naturally treated in all these and similar books—for example, in Henderson's *Handbook for Bible Classes*—without the slightest idea of the more recent investigations; the difficult and controverted question of the relation between the Hittites in the south and those in the north of Palestine, appears quite simple; the Amorites are always, following I believe an etymology of Ewald's, the Highlanders, whereas, in fact, it is the name in a particular document for the Canaanites in general. In these matters much might have been learned from German books; such *e.g.* as Riehm's *Biblisches Handwörterbuch*. In matters pertaining to later history, errors also occur. That: "Who was Neby Saleh? is a question still to be answered" (*Special Papers*, p. 268), is in a certain sense true; it should however have been mentioned, that the person under consideration appears in the Koran; and that Sheikh Sh'aïb (*sic*) is not merely "the native name of Jethro," but the name in the Koran. Recently it has

become the fashion to translate Bîr Eyyüb by Joab's well. Against this is not only the fact that Eyyüb is in the Koran the name for Job, but especially the passage in Mujîr ad dîn, which can be referred to in the translation of Sauvaire, p. 189.

What has been said is meant especially to show what direction the historical geographical investigation must take in order to escape such mistakes. In passing, it may be observed that the turning to account of the Arabic literature on the history and geography of Palestine, as the admirable articles of Gildemeister, in the *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina Vereins* show, promises much valuable information, and seems to us more important than the efforts, now so much in favour, to make something out of the very corrupt lists of places in Palestine handed down by the Egyptians. In the former case we are on firm ground!

One who, like the Reviewer, has spent a considerable time in the East, is naturally inclined to transfer the present state of things, as regards customs and language, to the ancient times, and to illustrate the latter by the former. In this endeavour there lies, as we know, a great danger; for upon a deeper study it is plain that even in the East the conditions have not remained as constant as at first glance it may seem to the observer. From this point of view the dogma which has come into vogue since the famous article of Ganneau (cf. *Special Papers*, p. 315), and is repeated in all popular publications, that the modern Fellahs represent the Canaanite population, must be rejected or at least greatly limited. In Egypt, indeed, as the type of the Fellahs proves, Egyptian blood has maintained itself; in other countries, for example in Mesopotamia and Babylonia, greater changes have probably occurred, and there is no evidence that the ethnographical character of the modern Fellahs of Palestine is connected

with that of the Canaanites. At least, the arguments for this view seem to us extremely weak. The geographical names of places may have passed down from one population to another. That they have been well preserved and handed down does not compel us to wider conclusions. The language of the Fellahs, at most, indicates that a certain influence of the Aramaic on the modern Arabic dialect may be traced; the assertion (*Special Papers*, p. 256), "the stock of the Fellah language is apparently Aramaic, as it was in the fourth (?) century," is simply to be taken back as erroneous, and rests upon lack of knowledge of the Aramaic and Arabic dialects.

Precisely similar is the case with the often repeated assertion "that there is a basis of polytheistic faith which most probably dates back to pre-Israelitic times." Aside from the fact that the sites of the modern Mohammedan saint-worship upon the hill tops may have been ancient sacred places, it would be just as easy to find the same 'basis of polytheistic faith' in Christianity and Judaism, as among the peasants of Palestine. A sifting of the traditions such as Goldzieher has prepared the way for in a noteworthy article (*Rev. de l'Hist. des Religions*, t. ii. No. 6), leads, especially when the Arabic travels in Palestine are taken into consideration, to the recognition of the fact, that like causes have like effects, and that Islam, by various influences, has been pushed on to the saint-worship into which it has fallen—a worship as different from the old idolatry as is the catholic image-worship. The doctrine of descent, therefore, which is current in all the works cited above—that the Moslim saint-worship is derived from the Canaanites, must be rejected, as much as the unfounded assertion of Conder (*Special Papers*, p. 258), that the Beduin are "heathen and moon worshippers, as in the time of Mohammed."

Precisely because a certain dependence on authority fills

a large place in the whole investigation as it is at present carried on in England, it is high time to combat it; otherwise, a great number of results which we deem extremely doubtful will pass over into all popular works. This dependence on authority has, as is easily comprehensible, a particular weakness for the later Jewish tradition. "What a learned rabbi in Jerusalem communicated to me" on this or that point (cf. *e.g.* *Statements*, 1873, p. 16), I should not without precaution believe, inasmuch as I should not have unqualified confidence in his method of research. The same doubt attaches to the frequent citation of passages from the Mishna and Talmud. Whether the men who set down in these works their opinions about the geography of Palestine, followed a genuine tradition—which may certainly have existed—must in each several case be carefully investigated. When, for example, in the *Memoirs*, the limits of the Shephela are fixed according to the Talmud, it is first of all requisite that the data of the Bible itself on this point be minutely examined. When, since Selah Merrill's book, Succoth is identified with Deir Allah, because the Talmud identifies Succoth with "Ter'ala," the first question is whether this is not a mere guess. The Talmudic identification of Tirzah—sought with so much pains!—with Tir'an, must certainly be given up.

It would no doubt be very desirable if we were able to identify all the names of places in Palestine which have been preserved to us. That in this direction, since the time when Robinson and Van de Velde, so to speak, took off the cream, much has been accomplished by the explorations of the Fund, we certainly should not deny. It will be the common task of exegetes more and more to sift these identifications; to separate the certain from the probable, the probable from the doubtful, and the doubtful from those—surely no small part of the whole!—of which nothing can be made. With all recognition of recent

achievements, we must say that the boundaries between the above named classes have not always been definitely enough maintained. In many cases we agree with the criticism which Mühlau—who in *Gesenius Wörterbuch* and his articles in Riehm's *Handwörterbuch*, is thoroughly master of the recent geographical literature—has, often tacitly, exercised.

It is true that correct opinion must gradually develop out of discussion, but we must always bear in mind that the latter, in so difficult a field, in which often historical, critical and exegetical questions must be taken into consideration, will not progress rapidly, but only by slow degrees, and that nothing has a more injurious effect than premature popularizing. The Committee of the Fund have repeatedly explained that the individual authors were alone responsible for their identifications; and in the *Memoirs* certain "suggestions" are rightly expressly designated as such. In many cases, however, the Fund appears to me—and indeed by the very publication of the Old and New Testament maps—to have contributed to the currency of uncertain identifications.

When Conder in the *Handbook* maintains that of 840 names of places in the Bible more than two-thirds have already been identified, and in the *Memoirs* (*Special Papers*, p. 255) triumphantly announces that of the 600 ancient names of places in Western Palestine, already "all but about 150 new sites have been fixed with more or less accuracy" by the Survey, he, judged by our standard, estimates the certainty of the more recent results decidedly too high. It is now, since the Map and the Name List have appeared, easier than it was before to find a resemblance in sound between the old name we are seeking and a modern one; but in the same way the danger of deceiving ourselves has increased. A number of identifications rest upon purely external resemblance of sound,

sometimes not so much between the Hebrew name and the Arabic, as between the latter and the "Authorised Version." As examples of such improved combinations I name:—

חֹסָה Hōsāh, Joshua xix. 29 = عَزَّةَ "Ezzīyah" (only "suggested" by Conder, *Memoirs*, I. 51).

הַנָּתָן Hannāt'hōn, Joshua xix. 14 = كَفْر عَنان Kefr 'Anān, *Memoirs*, I. 205.

נְעִיֶל Ne'ī'el, "Neiel," Joshua xix. 27. "The similarity of its name suggests its identification with Y'anin, یعنی." *Memoirs*, I. 286. Name List, 113. On the Old Test. Map it is identified with Tell en-Nahal, تل النهل.

כְּפַר הָעַמּוֹנִי Kefar ha-'ammōnī. "Chephar Haamonai, Joshua xviii. 24. It is probably the ruin (كفر عانا) north of Bethel, etc." (*Memoirs*, I. p. 299.)

Of this sort are very many identifications, not only in the *Memoirs*, but in other works. When, for example, Conder (*Tent Work*, I. 108) says: "This name Teiāsīr (تياصير, so Name List, p. 208), I suppose to be Tirzah (תִּרְצָה). It contains the exact letters of the Hebrew word, though the two last radicals are interchanged in position, etc." there is a possibility that the identification is right. The two words however are not so nearly identical as is represented. In fact Tirzah has been sought by some, since Robinson, in Tellūsa, by others elsewhere. In reality nothing can be positively made out about it.

Naturally with such a method of turning out identifications there will be a great deal of mere guessing in different directions. For a while one locality, then another, passes for the place which must at all cost be discovered, as though the most precious part of our Christianity depended upon it. Accordingly in the last volumes of the *Statements* the interminable vexed questions, whether Emmaus is to be looked for in Khamasa or Artās; where the place was to which the scapegoat was sent forth; where the nameless

city of Saul's journey lay, have been treated with extraordinary partiality. These and similar fruitless discussions, in which we really cannot discover the ultimate end of Palestine research, would disturb us very little, if it were not that in consequence of them dogmas establish themselves which can hardly be uprooted again. Among such we count for example the following:—

In consequence of Ganneau's discovery "Zehwele=Zohelath," 'En Rōgel is now generally identified with the Well of the Virgin, and even Schick had recently to take a sharp reproof, because he was not yet acquainted with the new dogma (cf. *Quarterly Statements*, 1885, p. 20), on which occasion Conder gave a fine new etymology of Rōgel. We believe it best for many reasons to remain more conservative, and to abide by the old combination with Bīr Eyyūb. So again topographical reasons are opposed to the, at present, favourite identification of Khūrbet 'Erma with Kiryath Ye'arim. That the ancient 'Ai has finally been found in Khūrbet Ḥai or Ḥayyān is to us by no means evident. Most recently it is claimed that the word corresponding to בְּאֵר לַחֵי רָאִי, Genesis xvi. 14, has been found in "Moilāhhi"—which, however, Conder himself doubts (*Statements*, 1885, p. 23). On the other hand he holds firmly to the traditional Tomb of Rachel, by which means he obtains a false centre for many other identifications. To the excellent discussion of this subject by Mühlau (cf. Riehm, p. 1263*b*.) it is now to be added that Schick's discovery of a Tomb of Rachel (*Zeitschr. des d. Pal. Ver.*, IV. 248), is a confirmation of the opinion that the Tomb of Rachel cannot originally have been shown scuth of Jerusalem, as is indeed manifest of itself from 1 Sam. x. 2 and Jer. xxxi. 15. In most recent works (cf. Henderson, p. 67) the identification of Adullam with "'Aid el-Mâ" or "'Aid el-Mi'eh" (*Memoirs*, III. 361), after Ganneau, obtains. This also appears to us to be one of the questions about

which nothing can be determined; certainly not with the arguments which have been adduced, and we are glad to see that recently (*Quarterly Statements*, 1884, p. 61 ff.) opposition to it has again appeared. The same thing is true of the identification of Megiddo with Mujedda' (*Memoirs*, II. 90-99), which indeed Conder himself treats as doubtful, but which nevertheless begins to pass over into other books. In our opinion Megiddo must be looked for on the Great Plain.

One of the gravest errors, to mention this also briefly, appears to us to be the assertion now quite prevalent in English works (comp. Henderson, p. 59; Conder, *Primer*, p. 39, and others), that the so-called Pentapolis lay at the northern end of the Dead Sea. The reasons for placing Zoar in the Ghor es Safiyeh are quite incontrovertible. Only false interpretations of passages like Genesis xiii. 10 and others, and groundless identifications (Zoar = شاغور; Gomorrah = 'Amriyeh), can have led to this extraordinary modern hypothesis. Let us hear, for example, the philological lucubration of Conder (*Tent Work*, II. 16) "Zeboim (צִבּוֹיִם) means hyenas" (unfortunately Gesenius, who thought himself bound to etymologise every proper name, is responsible for this) "and is identical with the Arabic Dubā'. Now the cliff just above the plain, near the site of Roman Jericho, is called Shakh ed Dubā'—lair of the hyena, but the title is Hebrew, not Arabic—Shakh being a word not found in the Arabic dictionary.¹ Might not Zeboim, I would ask, have stood here?" If any one has a curiosity to see more, he may read Henderson, p. 59, who also has a combination with Zeeb (זֵיב!), and teaches us that "Zeboim (or the two Zeebs?) is apparently derived from the name of the wolf"!

The excess of etymologising may be characterised as a

¹ Palmer was however so fortunate as to find an Arabic etymology (*Name List*, p. 350), "Staling of the hyena."

capital fault of recent Palestine research. As lately vigorous contradiction has rightly been aroused, in this regard, against Gesenius' Lexicon, so, only with sharper emphasis, must a veto be put upon the conclusions which are so often drawn from the etymology of names of places. When Conder, for example (*Special Papers*, p. 256), says: "'Ain el Jem'ain means apparently 'Spring of two troops,' and its position suggests it to be the well Harod, where Gideon divided the men who lapped from the rest," one finds the reference, to say the very least, exceedingly far-fetched; still more suspicious are references like this in regard to Jisr el-Mujami'a: "It is noticeable that this name may have some connexion with the 'Bridge of the Gatherer' over which the Persians believed the dead to pass, as noticed in the Zend Avesta." So a Neby Heyis is at once "probably" brought into connexion with Ahijah, a Neby Na'mân with Micah, a Neby Turfini with a Teraphim sanctuary, a Neby Leimun (!) with Lemuel (*Special Papers*, p. 268). Such combinations are found also in the Name List, *e.g.* p. 10, Neby Ma'shûk with Melkarth; p. 9, Sheikh or Neby Kâsim with Cadmus, and many more—combinations such as in Germany Sepp in Munich (*cf.* Name List, p. 1) alone makes, without convincing any one but himself of their trustworthiness.

But before we follow these etymologies further we must again, and at more length, turn our attention to the volume which contains the Name List. This list, collected by Conder and revised by the late Prof. Palmer, contains about 10,000 names. Palmer himself complains that the spelling of the names upon the map was fixed before he began his work, and that no more exact transcription—distinguishing *e.g.* between ح and ق; ك and ط; ش and س; was adopted. The assistance which Drake was able to give in the collection of the names could not prevent mistakes from creeping in; as indeed it often happened that

members of the Survey, who manifestly were not Arabic scholars, repeated the names which they had gathered to the scribe Kassatly, instead of his collecting them from the lips of the guides and natives and afterwards writing them down in Arabic characters. Palmer, therefore, rightly directs attention to the necessity of a future revision of the names. In such a revision the transcription, particularly, would have to be changed in more than one point. The list of the most common place-appellatives, which is printed in front of the map, and again, *Memoirs*, I. 42, proves that the author or authors of it had, unfortunately, no knowledge of Arabic grammar. As plural of "*Bâb*" is given "*Buwâb*," which is an altogether different word; of "*birke*," "*burâk*" instead of *burak*; as plural of *tell*, "*tellûl*." "*Khûrbeh*" and "*Kûryeh*" are said "before a vowel," to become "*Khûrbet*" and "*Kûryet*," a remark which betrays complete ignorance of the nature of an annexation, or a *status constructus*. The feminine ending is written sometimes with *eh*, as in *Lûbieh*; sometimes with *ah*, e.g. *Fûwârah*; sometimes with *a*, e.g. *Tubarîya*; again with *ey* or *y*, e.g. *Memoirs*, I. 221, *Kulunsawey*, Name List *Kulunsawy*; sometimes even with *eî*, as in *Deir el Kubbeî*; occasionally even with *at*, e.g. *'Ain Furâwîyat*. The designation of long and short vowels is decidedly defective—a long vowel has been consistently employed in the transcription wherever a *،* or *ﻉ* stands in a word, without regard to the cases in which these letters have the power of consonants, or, for our ear, mark a diphthong; e.g. *Deir*, *Jemâin*, *rûeihîneh*, *Sûweid*. Much more care should have been taken, too, in regard to the position of *ع* before or after a vowel. How is *Sh'aîb*, for example, to be pronounced?

In the Name List, Palmer has indeed made many improvements, and the Arabic text there given is, as far as it is trustworthy, an important help in the correction of the

names on the map. Unfortunately it was deemed necessary to find an etymology for all the proper nouns contained in the book, that is, to translate them. That very many of these proper names have a "descriptive character," is indeed self-evident. If it was thought best not to leave it to the student to hunt up such often occurring names in the dictionary, a short list of them might perhaps have been published to save trouble and to explain vulgar forms. In this way, in the first place, many repetitions would have been avoided, and secondly, only those proper names would have been translated which ought to be translated. As has been already said, the etymologising of proper names has at present fallen into deserved discredit; so many causes, such as passage from one language to another, popular etymologies, and so forth, are at work to make the oldest forms, which alone could profitably be etymologised, unrecognisable. Uncertain etymologies do more harm than good. Now, of the etymologies offered in the Name List, there are many which are not only uncertain, but judged from a stricter lexical standpoint, absolutely incorrect. We do not mean in saying this to detract anything from the merits of the late Prof. Palmer, whose practical knowledge of the language may have been considerable. The fact is, however, that very many of his etymologies are lugged in by the ears. Moreover, the derivations which were obtained from the guides, or natives who were familiar with the language of the people, are not distinguished from those which are made up by the help of the dictionary of classical Arabic. Now our dictionaries, translations of the original Arabic dictionaries, are notoriously of such a character that it is very easy to find any meaning you please, but very difficult to decide whether it actually occurs in the language. Frequently the etymologies in the Name List are simply brought into connexion with an Arabic root, without regard to the question whether

the *form* of the word which is to be explained is really found in the language or not. Examples of this are, page 1, the explanation of 'Ain el Aleiliyat "the spring of successive draughts or torrents, but it is probably a proper name," compare page 2, "'Ain el Mälliyeh, the spring of successive draughts or irrigations." Page 1 "'Ain Furâwiyat (*sic*) perhaps from فروة (why so derived?) in the sense of wasteland" (a very doubtful meaning). 'Ain el Hubeishiyeh, "The spring of the Abyssinian." Taking at random another page, say page 19, we find there the following erroneous, or at least wholly uncertain translations: *Shaib*, old man; *Hôwâsh* (*sic*) حواش fenced enclosure; *Meitûn*, p.n. from ميت dead; *Bir es Sâkfêh* (الساقفة) the roofed over well, On page 20, *Deir Kantâr* (قنطار) is translated "Convent of Arches." Is *Kantâr* possibly taken as plural of *kantâra*?

As uncertain, even misleading, as a considerable part of the Arabic etymologies, are many etymologies from the other Semitic dialects. On page 2 we read, under *Shidghith*, شدغيث, "cf. Heb. שדה, fields surrounding a city, and עת Phoen. for עמת, a vale;" p. 6, Hebrew רבשה, a hill; p. 37, under *Nimûr* it is asserted that "it also signifies running water" (unfortunately from Gesenius!); p. 153, the *hapax legomenon* זבִּרִים (2 Kings x. 8) must figure as a common name for "heaps"; and we are taught that תַּעֲנַנִּים means "sandy." It would lead us much too far if we were to give here more than single proof passages for our critical observations.

Conder's etymologies are naturally much wilder than Palmer's; for example, *Special Papers*, p. 264, *Dûhy*, general; *Mirwân*, enslaved; *Jami'a el Yetaim*, the mosque of the servants of God in Shiloh. The Hebrew proper names, too, are etymologised "according to the best authorities." We learn from them, *e.g.* that the name Shem (שֵׁם) means dark or brown (*Primer*, p. 30). It is the same thing with Henderson, who, for example, in regard to the Jordan

thinks that "it may be doubtful if the origin is not rather from the natural imitation of the sound of a river." That the Amorites always figure as "highlanders," the Hivites as "living in villages or towns," or as "midlanders," we can forgive, for, unhappily, such etymologies still haunt us even in Germany—compare for example Gesenius, **עֲדָלָם** righteousness of the people, for **עָדַל עִם** !! Let us leave such juggling to the Orientals; it has been, as everybody knows, from the beginning a favourite pursuit of the Arabs and the Jews.

It is too bad, though, when this kind of philological diletantism, as so often happens, sets itself to the interpretation of the Old Testament. Thus W. F. Birch recently (*Quart. Statements*, 1884, p. 67) instead of this same **מַעֲרַת עֲדָלָם** would read **מַעֲרַת עֵלָם**, and appealing to Prov. xxii. 28, xxiii. 10, "old landmark," translates, Cave of Eternity, *i.e.* "the Old Cave, whose fame has been handed down from generations past." We should greatly regret it if, as there seem to be some indications, the *Quarterly Statements*, instead of furnishing us new material, should yield to the disposition to solve exegetical problems.

We will not withhold from our readers a specimen of exegesis from another book. Henderson, p. 53, says: "It is not possible to look at many of the 'trilithons' (*i.e.* three stones) forming dolmens, such especially as stand like gateways to 'circles' and have charms attached to the passing through them, without having the suggestion presented that we have here a dim remembrance of the first altar by the gate of Paradise—at Babel toward the sun-rising (Genesis xxviii. 17)." How Henderson understands the passage of Genesis which he quotes, is to us wholly incomprehensible.

From what has been said certain conclusions follow.

1. The work laid before us by the Exploration Fund is indeed, through the abundance of the new material con-

tained in it, exceedingly valuable; but in more than one respect cannot be regarded as final, and is decidedly in need of revision.

2. Especially in the so-called Results of the Survey—particularly on the Old Testament map—there is urgent need of a searching discrimination between the tenable and the untenable, otherwise much that is only vague conjecture will find its way into popular writings as well established fact.

3. Not only with reference to the identifications, but especially to the philological conclusions and etymologies, much more care and the assistance of thorough professional scholars is urgently demanded.

I have written *sine ira et studio*, thinking that, as I have been for many years a subscriber, or rather a member of the English Society, I ought to express my mind frankly. In the welfare of the Society I am deeply interested, and deem it my duty to warn it against false paths. I cannot, however, enter into a further discussion of the points I have raised. If I had included all the things which I have noted, I would have to write a book. I must beg, however, that one thing must be kept in mind: if in the preceding pages blame seems to outweigh praise, it is in part lack of space which has prevented me from enlarging properly upon my cheerful recognition of the many things which have been accomplished. My judgment that much might have been, and still may be, improved, does not in the least diminish my gratitude to the men who, in the interest of this cause, have spent and still spend time, pains, and means.

Tübingen, May, 1885.

A. SOGIN.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

X.

PAUL'S STRIVING FOR THE COLOSSIANS.

"For I would have you know how greatly I strive for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh; that their hearts may be comforted, they being knit together in love, and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding, that they may know the mystery of God, even Christ, in whom are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden."—*COL. ii. 1-3 (Rev. Ver.)*.

WE have seen that the closing portion of the previous chapter is almost exclusively personal. In this context the same strain is continued, and two things are dwelt on: the Apostle's agony of anxiety for the Colossian Church, and the joy with which, from his prison, he travelled in spirit across mountain and sea, and saw them in their quiet valley, cleaving to the Lord. The former of these feelings is expressed in the words now before us; the latter, in the following verses.

All this long outpouring of self-revelation is so natural and characteristic of Paul that we need scarcely look for any purpose in it, and yet we may note with what consummate art he thereby prepares the way for the warnings which follow. The unveiling of his own throbbing heart was sure to work on the affections of his readers and to incline them to listen. His profound emotion in thinking of the preciousness of his message, would help to make them feel how much was at stake, and his unfaltering faith would give firmness to their less tenacious grasp of the truth which, as they saw, he gripped with such force. Many truths may be taught coolly, and some must be. But in religious matters, arguments wrought in frost are powerless, and earnestness approaching to passion is the all-conquering force. A teacher who is afraid to show his feelings, or who has no feelings to show, will never gather many disciples.

So this revelation of the Apostle's heart is relevant to the great purposes of the whole letter—the warning against error, and the exhortation to steadfastness. In the verses which we are now considering, we have the conflict which Paul was waging set forth in three aspects: first, in itself; second, in regard to the persons for whom it was waged; and, finally and principally, in regard to the object or purpose in view therein. The first and second of these points may be dealt with briefly. The third will require further consideration.

I. Notice the conflict, which he earnestly desired that the Colossian Christians might know to be “great.” The word rendered in the Authorised Version “conflict,” belongs to the same root as that which occurs in the last verse of the previous chapter, and is there rendered “striving.” The Revised Version rightly indicates this connexion by its translation, but fails to give the construction as accurately as the older translation does. “What great strife I have” would be nearer the Greek, and more forcible than the somewhat feeble “how greatly I strive,” which the Revisers have adopted. The conflict referred to is, of course, that of the arena, as so often in Paul's writings.

But how could he, in Rome, wage conflict on behalf of the Church at Colossæ? No external conflict can be meant. He could strike no blows on their behalf. What he could do in that way, he did, and he was now taking part in their battle by this letter. If he could not fight by their side, he could send them ammunition, as he does in this great Epistle, which was, no doubt, to the eager combatants for the truth at Colossæ, what it has been ever since, a magazine and arsenal in all their warfare. But the real struggle was in his own heart. It meant anxiety, sympathy, an agony of solicitude, a passion of intercession. What he says of Epaphras in this very Epistle was true of himself. He was “always striving in prayer for them.” And by

These wrestlings of spirit he took his place among the combatants, though they were far away, and though in outward seeming, his life was untouched by any of the difficulties and dangers which hemmed them in. In that lonely prison-cell, remote from their conflict, and with burdens enough of his own to carry, with his life in peril, his heart yet turned to them and, like some soldier left behind to guard the base while his comrades had gone forward to the fight, his ears listened for the sound of battle, and his thoughts were in the field. His prison cell was like the focus of some reverberating gallery in which every whisper spoken all round the circumference was heard, and the heart that was held captive there was set vibrating in all its chords by every sound from any of the Churches.

Let us learn the lesson, that for all Christian people sympathy in the battle for God which is being waged all over the world is plain duty. For all Christian teachers of every sort, an eager sympathy in the difficulties and struggles of those whom they would try to teach is indispensable. We can never deal wisely with any mind until we have entered into its peculiarities. We can never help a soul fighting with errors and questionings until we have ourselves felt the pinch of the problems, and have shown that soul that we know what it is to grope, and stumble. No man is ever able to lift a burden from another's shoulders except on condition of bearing the burden himself. If I stretch out my hand to some poor brother struggling in "the miry clay," he will not grasp it and my well-meant efforts will be vain, unless he can see that I too have felt with him the horror of great darkness, and desire him to share with me the benedictions of the light.

Wheresoever our prison or our workshop may be, howsoever Providence or circumstances—which is but a heathenish word for the same thing—may separate us from active participation in any battle for God, we are bound to take an

eager share in it by sympathy, by interest, by such help as we can render, and by that intercession which may sway the fortunes of the field, though the uplifted hands grasp no weapons, and the spot where we pray be far from the fight. It is not only the men who bear the brunt of the battle in the high places of the field who are the combatants. In many a quiet home where their wives and mothers sit, with wistful faces waiting for the news from the front, is an agony of anxiety, and as true a share in the struggle as amidst the battery smoke and the gleaming bayonets. It was a law in Israel, "As his part is that goeth down to the battle, so shall his part be that abideth by the stuff. They shall part alike." They were alike in recompense, because they were rightly regarded as alike in service. So all Christians who have in heart and sympathy taken part in the great battle shall be counted as combatants and crowned as victors, though they themselves have struck no blows. "He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward."

II. We notice the persons for whom this conflict was endured. They are the Christians of Colossæ, and their neighbours of Laodicea, and "as many as have not seen my face in the flesh." It may be a question whether the Colossians and Laodiceans belong to "those who have not seen his face in the flesh," but the most natural view of the words is that the last clause "introduces the whole class to which the persons previously enumerated belong,"¹ and this conclusion is confirmed by the silence of the Acts of the Apostles as to any visit of Paul's to these Churches, and by the language of the Epistle itself, which, in several places, refers to his knowledge of the Colossian Church as derived from hearing of them, and never alludes to personal intercourse. That being so, one can understand that its members might easily think that he cared less for them than he did

¹ Bishop Lightfoot, *in loc.*

for the more fortunate communities which he had himself planted or watered, and might have suspected that the difficulties of the Church at Ephesus, for instance, lay nearer his heart than theirs in their remote upland valley. No doubt, too, their feelings to him were less warm than to Epaphras and to other teachers whom they had heard. They had never felt the magnetism of his personal presence, and were at a disadvantage in their struggle with the errors which were beginning to lift their snaky heads among them, from not having had the inspiration and direction of his teaching.

It is beautiful to see how, here, Paul lays hold of that very fact which seemed to put some film of separation between them, in order to make it the foundation of his especial keenness of interest in them. Precisely because he had never looked them in the eyes, they had a warmer place in his heart, and his solicitude for them was more tender. He was not so enslaved by sense that his love could not travel beyond the limits of his eyesight. He was the more anxious about them because they had not the recollections of his teaching and of his presence to fall back upon.

III. But the most important part of this section is the Apostle's statement of the great subject of his solicitude, that which he anxiously longed that the Colossians might attain. It is a prophecy, as well as a desire. It is a statement of the deepest purpose of his letter to them, and being so, it is likewise a statement of the Divine desire concerning each of us, and of the Divine design of the gospel. Here is set forth what God would have all Christians to be, and what He has given us ample means of being in Jesus Christ.

1. The first element in the Apostle's desire for them is "that their hearts may be comforted." Of course the Biblical use of the word "heart" is much wider than the modern popular use of it. We mean by it, when we use it in ordinary talk, the hypothetical seat of the emotions, and

chiefly, the organ and throne of love; but Scripture means by the word, the whole inward personality, including thought and will as well as emotion. So we read of the "thoughts and intents of the heart," and the whole inward nature is called "the hidden man of the heart."

And what does he desire for this inward man? That it may be "comforted." That word again has a wider signification in Biblical, than in Nineteenth century English. It is much more than consolation in trouble. The cloud that hung over the Colossian Church was not about to break in sorrows which they would need consolation to bear, but in doctrinal and practical errors which they would need strength to resist. They were called to fight rather than to endure, and what they needed most was courageous confidence. So Paul desires for them that their hearts should be *encouraged* or strengthened, that they might not quail before the enemy, but go into the fight with buoyancy, and be of good cheer.

Is there any greater blessing in view both of the conflict which Christianity has to wage to-day, and of the difficulties and warfare of our own lives, than that brave spirit, which plunges into the struggle with the serene assurance that victory sits on our helms and waits upon our swords, and knows that anything is possible rather than defeat? That is the condition of overcoming—even our faith. "The sad heart tires in a mile," but the strong hopeful heart carries in its very strength the prophecy of triumph.

Such a disposition is not altogether a matter of temperament, but may be cultivated, and though it may come easier to some of us than to others, it certainly ought to belong to all who have God to trust to, and believe that the gospel is His truth. They may well be strong who have Divine power ready to flood their hearts, who know that everything works for their good, who can see, above the whirl of time and change, one strong loving Hand which

moves the wheels. What have we to do with fear for ourselves, or wherefore should our "hearts tremble for the ark of God," seeing that One fights by our sides who will teach our hands to war and cover our heads in the day of battle? "Be of good courage, and He shall strengthen thine heart."

2. The way to secure such joyous confidence and strength is taught us here, for we have next, *Union in love*, as part of the means for obtaining it—"They being knit together in love"—the persons, not the hearts, are to be thus united. Love is the true bond which unites men—the bond of perfectness, as it is elsewhere called. That unity in love would, of course, add to the strength of each. The old fable teaches us that little fagots bound together are strong, and the tighter the rope is pulled, the stronger they are. A solitary heart is timid and weak, but many weaknesses brought together make a strength, as slimly built houses in a row hold each other up, or dying embers raked closer burst into flame. Loose grains of sand are light and moved by a breath; compacted they are rock against which the Atlantic beats in vain. So, a Church of which the members are bound together by that love which is the only real bond of Church life presents a front to threatening evils through which they cannot break. A real moral defence against even intellectual error will be found in such a close compaction in mutual Christian love. A community so interlocked will throw off many evils, as a Roman legion with linked shields roofed itself over against missiles from the wall of a besieged city, or the imbricated scales on a fish keep it dry in the heart of the sea.

But we must go deeper than this in interpreting these words. The love which is to knit Christian men together is not merely love to one another, but is common love to Jesus Christ. Such common love to Him is the true bond of union, and the true strengthener of men's hearts.

3. This compaction in love will lead to a wealth of certitude in the possession of the truth.

Paul is so eagerly desirous for the Colossians' union in love to each other and all to God, because He knows that such union will materially contribute to their assured and joyful possession of the truth. It tends, he thinks, unto "all riches of the full assurance of understanding," by which he means the wealth which consists in the entire, unwavering certitude which takes possession of the understanding, the confidence that it has the truth and the life in Jesus Christ. Such a joyful steadfastness of conviction that I have grasped the truth is opposed to hesitating half belief. It is attainable, as this context shows, by paths of moral discipline, and amongst them, by seeking to realize our unity with our brethren and not proudly rejecting the "common faith" because it is common. Possessing that assurance, we shall be rich and heart whole. Walking amid certainties we shall walk in paths of peace, and re-echo the triumphant assurance of the Apostle, to whom love had given the key of knowledge:—"we know that we are of God, and we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know Him that is true."

In all times of religious unsettlement, when an active propaganda of denial is going on, Christian men are tempted to lower their own tone, and to say, "It is so," with somewhat less of certainty, because so many are saying, "It is not so." Little Rhoda needs some courage to affirm constantly that "it was even so," when apostles and her masters keep assuring her that she has only seen a vision. In this day, many professing Christians falter in the clear assured profession of their faith, and it does not need a keen ear to catch an undertone of doubt making their voices tremulous. Some even are so afraid of being thought "narrow," that they seek for the reputation of liberality by talking as if there were a film of doubt over even the truths which used

to be "most surely believed." Much of the so-called faith of this day is all honeycombed with secret misgivings, which have in many instances no other intellectual basis than the consciousness of prevalent unbelief and a second-hand acquaintance with its teachings. Few things are more needed among us now than this full assurance and satisfaction of the understanding with the truth as it is in Jesus. Nothing is more wretched than the slow paralysis creeping over faith, the fading of what had been stars into darkness. A tragedy is being wrought in many minds which have had to exchange Christ's "Verily, verily," for a miserable "perhaps," and can no longer say "I know," but only, "I would fain believe," or at the best, "I incline to think still." On the other hand, the "full assurance of the understanding" brings wealth. It breathes peace over the soul, and gives endless riches in the truths which through it are made living and real.

This wealth of conviction is attained by living in the love of God. Of course, there is an intellectual discipline which is also needed. But no intellectual process will lead to an assured grasp of spiritual truth, unless it be accompanied by love. As soon may we lay hold of truth with our hands, as of God in Christ with our understandings alone. This is the constant teaching of Scripture—that, if we would know God and have assurance of Him, we must love Him. "In order to love human things, it is necessary to know them. In order to know Divine things, it is necessary to love them." When we are rooted and grounded in love, we shall be able to know—for what we have most need to know and what the Gospel has mainly to teach us is the love, and "unless the eye were sunlike, how could it see the sun?" Unless the eye with which we look is love, how shall we know love? If we love, we shall possess an experience which verifies the truth for us, will give us an irrefragable demonstration which will bring certitude to ourselves, how-

ever little it may avail to convince others. Rich in the possession of this confirmation of the gospel by the blessings which have come to us from it, and which witness of their source, as the stream that dots some barren plain with a line of green along its course is revealed thereby, we shall have the right to oppose the full assurance born of love to many a doubt, and while others are disputing whether there be any God, or any living Christ, or any forgiveness of sins, or any guiding providence, we shall know that they are, and are ours, because we have felt the power and wealth which they have brought into our lives.

4. This unity of love will lead to full knowledge of the mystery of God. Such seems to be the connexion of the next words, which may be literally read "unto the full knowledge of the mystery of God," and may be best regarded as a co-ordinate clause with the preceding, depending like it on "being knit together in love." So taken, there is set forth a double issue of that compaction in love to God and one another, namely, the calm assurance in the grasp of truth already possessed, and the more mature and deeper insight into the deep things of God. The word for knowledge here is the same as in i. 9, and here as there means a full knowledge. The Colossians had known Christ at first, but the Apostle's desire is that they may come to a fuller knowledge, for the object to be known is infinite, and endless degrees in the perception and possession of His power and grace are possible. In that fuller knowledge they will not leave behind what they knew at first, but will find in it deeper meaning, a larger wisdom and a fuller truth.

Among the large number of readings of the following words, that which is adopted by the Revised Version is to be preferred, and the translation which it gives is the most natural and that which is in accordance with the previous thought in chapter i. 27, where also "the mystery" is explained to be "Christ in you." A slight variation in the

conception is presented here. The "mystery" is Christ, not "in you," but "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." The great truth long hidden, now revealed, is that the whole wealth of spiritual insight (knowledge), and of reasoning on the truths thus apprehended so as to gain an ordered system of belief and a coherent law of conduct (wisdom), is stored for us in Christ.

Such being in brief the connexion and outline meaning of these great words, we may touch upon the various principles embodied in them. We have seen, in commenting upon a former part of the Epistle, the force of the great thought of Christ in His relations to us, as being the mystery of God, and need not repeat what was then said. But we may pause for a moment on the fact that the knowledge of that mystery has its stages. The revelation of the mystery is complete. No further stages are possible in that. But while the revelation is, in Paul's estimate, finished, and the long concealed truth now stands in full sunshine, our apprehension of it may grow, and there is a mature knowledge possible. Some poor ignorant soul catches through the gloom a glimpse of God manifested in the flesh, and bearing his sins. That soul will never outgrow that knowledge, but as the years pass, life and reflection and experience will help to explain and deepen it. God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son—there is nothing beyond that truth. Grasped however imperfectly, it brings light and peace. But as it is loved and lived by, it unfolds undreamed-of depths, and flashes with growing brightness. Suppose that a man could set out from the great planet that moves on the outermost rim of our system, and could travel slowly inwards towards the central sun, how the disc would grow, and the light and warmth increase with each million of miles that he crossed, till what had seemed a point filled the whole sky! Christian growth is into, not away from Christ, a penetrating deeper into the centre, and a drawing

out into distinct consciousness as a coherent system, all that was wrapped, as the leaves in their brown sheath, in that first glimpse of Him which saves the soul.

These stages are infinite, because in Him are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. These four words, *treasures, wisdom, knowledge, hidden*, are all familiar on the lips of the later Gnostics, and were so, no doubt, in the mouths of the false teachers at Colossæ. The Apostle would assert for his gospel all which they falsely claimed for their dreams. As in several other places of this Epistle, he avails himself of his antagonists' special vocabulary, transferring its terms, from the illusory phantoms which a false knowledge adorned with them, to the truth which he had to preach. He puts special emphasis on the predicate "hidden" by throwing it to the end of the sentence—a peculiarity which is reproduced with advantage in the Revised Version.

All wisdom and knowledge are in Christ. He is the Light of men, and all thought and truth of every sort come from Him who is the Eternal Word, the Incarnate Wisdom. That Incarnate Word is the perfect Revelation of God, and by His one completed life and death has declared the whole name of God to his brethren, of which all other media of revelation have but uttered broken syllables. That ascended Christ breathes wisdom and knowledge into all who love Him, and still pursues, by giving us the Spirit of wisdom, His great work of revealing God to men, according to His own word, which at once asserted the completeness of the revelation made by His earthly life and promised the perpetual continuance of the revelation from His heavenly seat: "I have declared Thy name unto my brethren, and will declare it."

In Christ, as in a great storehouse, lie all the riches of spiritual wisdom, the massive ingots of solid gold which when coined into creeds and doctrines are the wealth of the

world. All which we can know concerning God and man, concerning sin and righteousness and duty, concerning another life, is in Him who is the home and deep mine where truth is stored.

In Christ these treasures are "hidden," but not, as the heretics' mysteries were hidden, in order that they might be out of reach of the vulgar crowd. This mystery is hidden indeed, but it is revealed. It is hidden only from the eyes that will not see it. It is hidden that seeking souls may have the joy of seeking and the rest in finding. The very act of revealing is a hiding, as our Lord has said in His great thanksgiving because these things are (by one and the same act) "hid from the wise and prudent, and revealed to babes." They are hid, as men store provisions in the Arctic regions, in order that the bears may not find them and the shipwrecked sailors may.

Such thoughts have a special message for times of agitation such as the Colossian Church was passing through, and such as we have to face. We too are surrounded by eager confident voices, proclaiming profounder truths and a deeper wisdom than the gospel gives us. In joyful antagonism to these, Christian men have to hold fast by the confidence that all Divine wisdom is laid up in our Lord. We need not go to others to learn new truth. The new problems of each generation to the end of time will find their answers in Christ, and new issues of that old message which we have heard from the beginning will continually be discerned. Let us not wonder if the lessons which the earlier ages of the Church drew from that infinite storehouse fail at many points to meet the eager questionings of to-day. Nor let us suppose that the stars are quenched because the old books of astronomy are in some respects out of date. We need not cast aside the truths that we learned at our mother's knees. The central fact of the universe and the perfect encyclopædia of all moral and spiritual truth is Christ,

the Incarnate Word, the Lamb slain, the ascended King. If we keep true to Him and strive to widen our minds to the breadth of that great message, it will grow as we gaze, even as the nightly heavens expand to the eye which stedfastly looks into them, and reveal violet abysses sown with sparkling points, each of which is a sun. "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."

The ordinary type of Christian life is contented with a superficial acquaintance with Christ. Many understand no more of Him and of His gospel than they did when first they learned to love Him. So completely has the very idea of a progressive knowledge of Jesus Christ faded from the horizon of the average Christian that "edification," which ought to mean the progressive building up of the character course by course, in new knowledge and grace, has come to mean little more than the sense of comfort derived from the reiteration of old and familiar words which fall on the ear with a pleasant murmur. There is sadly too little first-hand and growing knowledge of their Lord, among Christian people, too little belief that fresh treasures may be found hidden in that field which, to each soul and each new generation struggling with its own special forms of the burdens and problems that press upon humanity, would be cheaply bought by selling all, but may be won at the easier rate of earnest desire to possess them, and faithful adherence to Him in whom they are stored for the world. The condition of growth for the branch is abiding in the vine. If our hearts are knit together with Christ's heart in that love which is the parent of communion, both as delighted contemplation and as glad obedience, then we shall daily dig deeper into the mine of wealth which is hid in Him that it may be found, and draw forth an unfailing supply of things new and old.

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

A CRITICAL ESTIMATE.

THIRD PAPER.

THE decree of the "Revision Committee of Convocation" elevated the A.V. during the period of the Revisers' labours to the status of an Austrian constitution. No change was to be lawful till two-thirds of the assembly voted for it. Passages were thus discussed not on their own merits, but on the assumption that the A.V. was probably right. To this systematic prejudication we emphatically object. It was an injustice to the Revisers themselves; and a greater injustice to the Hebrew authors. The rights of conservative minorities may deserve recognition in politics, but in questions of scholarship they have no place. Besides, ungracious though it would be to discuss the *personnel* of the Company, were not several members distinguished for proficiency in Arabic, Syriac, or Greek rather than Hebrew? The services of these specialists were required for the very few passages where the issue is not to be determined by Hebrew scholarship alone. Did they vote in all cases? Were they often units in the fraction (a third and one over) which could exercise the functions of a conservative majority? Of course statistics on such points cannot fairly be demanded.

In our opinion pretensions to finality have been tried too often in Bible-translations. They are out of date. We think that the A.V. will in the end rather lose by these attempts to bolster up its prestige, and that several Revisers must regret having consented to work under such conditions. Had the fixed object been to tabulate the worst A.V. mistranslations for some religious body, this kind of conservatism would be less objectionable. But the R.V.

is not a mere index of errors. It became, perhaps despite itself, a new translation. The two-thirds rule will be forgotten, so too the voting powers of the specialists. The public will not understand that in controverted passages the R.V. does *not* represent unbiassed Hebrew scholarship. On the other hand, in course of time intelligent men will require yet another translation, on a very different basis.

What constitutes excellence in translation-work? A happy combination of faithfulness and perspicuity, with as much literary elegance as can be thrown in *gratis*. "Bohn English" may be useful for the purposes of pass-men, but even when tinged with a Jacobean flavouring, it scarcely recommends its subject. In the Revised N.T. elegance was certainly pretermitted; and the neglect was not atoned for in the estimation of the public by gains in faithfulness and perspicuity. Did the O.T. Company take warning by its neighbour's fate? Or is it that O.T. idioms have so far leavened our language that Hebrew lends itself more readily than Greek for translation purposes? Certainly the Revised O.T. is less "rough" than the N.T.; its diction is better balanced, and jars less on an ear habituated to the A.V. It has no pretensions to literary beauty, but it may boast that rhythmical sonorousness, which with somnolent hearers often atones for want of lucid sense. The Revised N.T. could hardly be read in a cathedral service with effect; the O.T. might be.

In point of faithfulness we should award the palm to the N.T. In point of perspicuity the Versions are on a par. We hold it is impossible to reproduce such a terse writer as St. Paul under the thrall of literalism. We are sure that Hebrew thought cannot be done justice to, without constantly expanding, paraphrasing, and eliminating obsolete metaphor. But this was just what our Revisers could not do save in extreme cases.¹ Their aim was to

¹ Yet how hopeless it is to attempt a reproduction of style in translation.

patch up the Version of 1611, not to translate in bold modern English. Now perhaps the truest verdict ever passed on the A.V. was that of John Selden, who lived when it came out, and was not biassed by the unreasoning predilections of our days. He admits the superiority of this Version to its predecessors, and then proceeds :—

“There is no book so translated as the Bible for the purpose. If I translate a French book into English, I turn it into English phrase, not into French-English. *Il fait froid* I say ’tis cold, not it makes cold: but the Bible is rather translated into English words than into English phrase. The Hebraisms are kept, and the phrase of that language is kept. . . . which is well enough so long as scholars have to do with it; but when it comes among the common people, Lord what gear do they make of it.”¹

Much of this “word for word” translation disappears in the R.V., but excess of literalism remains, of course, the connecting link between it and the A.V. It is what no scholar would tolerate in the translation of a Greek or Latin classic; what the translator of Oriental literature outside the Scripture Canon would scrupulously avoid. Literalism has its claims, and we have shown how it should put us *en rapport* with the times and customs brought before us in the original. But this does by no means entail a reproduction of obscure or misleading *idioms*. Let us not confound such literalism with faithfulness. Here, if anywhere, to “follow the letter” is indeed to “miss the spirit.”

I. We will first then cite cases of common Hebrew phrases which cannot be dealt with on principles of servile literalism. One whole class of selections might be made in connexion with such words as “*soul*” (Hebrew נֶפֶשׁ = ‘desire,’ or ‘life;’ rarely the “soul” of our religious

work is shown in the R.V. of Ps. xvii. 7. The original is perspicuous with seven words, the R.V. obscure with twenty-six. Again in Ps. xlix. 14, R.V. has sixteen English words for five Hebrew, and in Ps. lxxix. 11, fifteen for five.

¹ Selden’s Table-Talk. *Bible, Scripture.*

idiom); "*heart*" (Hebrew לב=often the seat of "understanding," not of "compassion"); "*bowels*" (=the seat of "compassion"); "*hand*" (used where we should say "strength" or "assistance"); "*eye*" (where we should say "glance"). Thus Ps. xix. 7, "The law of the Lord is perfect, *restoring the soul*." This is not much more accurate than the A.V. "converting the soul." The fact is there is no direct ethical significance in the words we italicize. They might be applied to a draught of cold water. They mean in modern idiom, "*refreshing the spirit*."

Gen. ii. 7, "Man became a *living soul*." This should perhaps rather have been reserved for our list of bad translations. Does the English reader suspect that, so far from the creation of the "soul" being described, the Hebrew words are identically those used of the creation of aquatic and terrestrial animals just before (Gen. i. 20, 24). They are there rendered "*living creature*," and must be so rendered here. If we are pressed with St. Paul's application of the LXX.'s εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν we reply that the LXX. gives the same translation *in re* the irrational animals of Gen. i. 20, 24.

Eccl. x. 2, "A wise man's *heart* is at his right hand, but a fool's at his left." The seat of understanding is meant. The wise is *intellectually* right-handed, the fool left-handed. Who will gather this from the R.V. translation? On the other hand the R.V. rightly alters the A.V. "heart" to "understanding" in several places, *e.g.* Hos. vii. 11. Jer.

xxxi. 20, "Therefore my *bowels* are troubled for him." The phrase is very unpalatable considering Who is the speaker. Why not render "*My compassion* is stirred on his behalf?" What does it matter to the reader that the ancients located compassion in the "bowels"? The Revised N.T. prepared the way for a clean sweep of this archaic pathology by giving "ye are straitened in your own *affections*," in 2 Cor. vi. 12. It is a pity the lead

was not followed more consistently throughout the O.T.

"Hand" has been altered to "power" or "strength" in some places, but we have in Job xxi. 16, "Lo, their prosperity is *not in their hand*," where we would substitute "*not in their own power*."

Song iv. 9 retains "Thou hast ravished my heart *with one of thine eyes*." Surely the R.V. should have here given "*with a single glance*," just as in vii. 8 it rightly renders "the smell of thy *breath* like apples," instead of repeating the A.V. literalism, "the smell of thy *nose* like apples." By the way, who uses the noun "*loves*" nowadays in sense of "*caresses*" (Prov. vii. 18)?

"*My glory*" is retained where it means my highest faculty, "my soul." Thus Ps. vii. 5, "Tread my life down to the earth, and lay *my glory* in the dust;" which conveys quite a wrong sense to the English reader. This literalism is repeated in Pss. xvi. 9; xxx. 12; cviii. 1.

To "lift up the hand" indicates in Heb. an asseveration by oath. The R.V. in Ps. cvi. 26, "Therefore he *lifted up his hand* unto them, that he would overthrow them in the wilderness," is liable to be misunderstood. We must render "Therefore he *sware unto them*," etc. So also in Num. xiv. 30.

The metaphor which represents religious apostasy as "*fornication*," might in many cases have been advantageously expunged. We are certain it is often understood literally. In Ps. lxxiii. 27, for instance, we would substitute "Thou hast destroyed all them *that are false to thee*," for "*that go a whoring from thee*."

A "*sacrifice*" in Heb. often implies the joyous feast following the religious rite; and thus includes ideas quite strange to the English equivalent. In Prov. xvii. 1 the R.V. rightly gives "Better is a dry morsel and quietness, than a house full of *feasting*" (A.V. "sacrifices"). And in Isa. xxix. 1, "Let the *feasts* (A.V. "sacrifices") come round." But who will see in Prov. vii.

14, "*Sacrifices* of peace offerings are with me, this day have I paid my vows," that the speaker means she has a house full of good cheer? We may add that שלמים "an offering," has no direct connexion with שלום "peace." We render therefore, "I am keeping a *sacrificial feast*, I have discharged my vows to-day."

"Wind," in Heb., often denotes "moral emptiness," or "inanity." It has no such force in English. What sense will the reader make of "the man walking *in wind* and falsehood," Mic. ii. 11?

The terms "*God*" and "*Jehovah*" are often used in Heb. to qualify substantives with attributes of excellence. Thus the Heb. "*mountains of God*," in Ps. xxxvi. 6, simply means "*great mountains*," as A.V. We regret that the Revisers think fit to amend here in the direction of literalism. They might as reasonably give "a prince of God" instead of "a mighty prince" in Gen. xxiii. 6. The fact is this idiom conveys quite different ideas in English, and must be dropped. The "*garden of the Lord*," Gen. xiii. 10, should be "*a very fertile garden*;" and the "*cedars of God*," Ps. lxxx. 10, were well represented by the A.V.'s "*goodly cedars*." In Ps. lxviii. 15, the maintenance of this Hebrew idiom is most disastrous. The R.V. gives "*a mountain of God* is the mountain of Bashan." Of course many readers will imagine the highlands of Bashan were peculiarly sacred. But this is exactly what the Psalmist does *not* mean. Bashan had only "*a mighty mountain-range*": it is the lowly Zion which God has chosen for His abode, and its sanctity amply compensates for its inferior height (cf. ver. 16). There is doubtless a "play on words" here, such as we frequently meet with in the Oriental languages, but this cannot be reproduced in translation.

"*To repent oneself*" in Heb. often practically means "to have compassion on others." If we render literally, this sense is obscured to the English reader, *e.g.* in Ps. cxxxv. 14,

"The Lord shall . . . *repent himself concerning* his servants." Here and in Ps. xc. 13; Deut. xxxii. 36, we must substitute "*have compassion on.*" "*Weary,*"

in the language of the arid East particularly denotes the languor consequent on thirst, and when applied to a land, indicates the effect of drought. In this rainy country, not all will understand the idiom "a *weary* land." There was no need to alter the A.V.'s "*thirsty* land." A

favourite phrase of Ecclesiastes is rendered in R.V. "Then I *returned and saw*" (iv. 1, 7; ix. 11). This common combination of verbs is simply due to the paucity of adverbs in Hebrew. In English we say "I saw again," or rather, "*I looked again and saw.*" Similarly in Ps. lxxviii. 41, R.V. gives "They *turned again, and* tempted God," where the meaning is "*Repeatedly* they tempted God."

"A *deep* speech" is not an English idiom, but in Heb. it means a strange, *unintelligible* language. Why does R.V. retain the literalism, "people of a deep speech," in Isa. xxxiii. 19, while the same words are rendered "people of a *strange* speech," in Ezek. iii. 5.

II. Literalism has dealt cruelly with the Hebrew prepositions, the "status constructivus," and the possessive pronouns. Isa. liii. 5 still runs, "the chastisement *of* our peace was upon him." Hebrew-English worded on the assumption that the "constructive" is to be represented by our genitive! Of course we must render "The chastisement *tending to* our peace," etc.

In Prov. viii. 2 we have, "Keep the king's command, and that in regard of the oath *of* God"; and in 1 Kings ii. 43, "Why then hast thou not kept the oath *of* the Lord." Why not write in plain English, "the oath made *to* God," or "*to* the Lord"?

Amos. v. 26, "The star *of* your God which ye made for yourselves." Here the constructive denotes apposition. We render "your *star-god* which ye made for yourselves."

In Ps. lxix. 9 (quoted in John ii.

17), the Revisers retain the phrase "The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up." Hebrew-English again. The "constructive" here represents not "of" but "*for*." In

Zech. xi. 4, "Feed the flock of the slaughter," common sense demands, "flock *destined for* the slaughter."

In Zech. ix. 12, we have "Turn you to the stronghold, *ye prisoners of hope*." Unintelligible Hebrew-English, for which we would substitute the periphrasis, "*ye prisoners, who yet cherish hope*." In Isa. xxvi. 4, literalism

reproduces a preposition which has no equivalent in English idiom, "For *in* the Lord Jehovah is an everlasting rock."

We might as well render in Ps. lxxviii. 4 (where the same construction occurs), "*In* Jah is his name." The A.V. was

better than this, though it lost the figure of the Divine Rock—"For in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength."

But why not keep the figure and drop the preposition? "*In*" is equally superfluous in Ps. lxii. 7, "The rock of my strength, and my refuge is *in* God." Isa. xxvi. 13,

"Other lords beside thee have had the dominion over us, but *by thee* only will we make mention of thy name." If we so take the verse, "by thee" must be paraphrased to give clear sense. Rend. "It is only *through thy help* that we celebrate thy name."

Similarly Ps. lvi. 10, "*In* God will I praise his word," really means "*Through God's help* I will praise his word of promise." Ps. lvi. 12,

"Thy vows are *upon* me O God." The reader has to think twice before he apprehends the meaning, "*Incumbent on me* are the vows made *to thee*, O God." In Song iii.

10, what is meant by saying that Solomon's palanquin was "paved with love *from* the daughters of Jerusalem"? If "*by*" is intended, why not give "*by*"? The Heb. however may well mean "paved with love *for*," as A.V.

III. Closely connected with this vice of literalism is the obscurity which hangs about so many noble passages. A free rendering or paraphrase was necessary; but the Revisers

dared not attempt it. Thus Isa. i. 13 is left in Cimmerian darkness. "Incense is an abomination unto me; new moon and sabbath, the calling of assemblies,—I cannot away with iniquity and the solemn meeting." The A.V. was at least intelligible. We have no idea what the R.V. means. Isaiah intended, we believe, "Incense is an abomination unto me; so too are new-moon and sabbath, and calling of assemblies: iniquity and solemn-assembly I cannot tolerate in conjunction."

Isa. xxxiii. 18. This beautiful description of Israel's relief from recent danger was obscured in the A.V.'s "Thine heart shall *meditate terror*." The R.V. is better, "Thine heart shall *muse on the terror*." But why not add "*of the past*"?

Isa. lviii. 13, "If thou . . . call the sabbath a delight, and the *holy* of the Lord honourable." This too is more accurate than the A.V., but why not give what is obviously meant—"the *holy [day]* of the Lord"? Readers may think this "holy" thing is something other than the Sabbath, the temple for instance.

Isa. lxi. 4, "They shall raise up the *former desolations*." No such idiom would be permitted in ordinary literature. The Heb. means "They shall raise up *what has lain in desolation for years past*." Little better is Ps. lxxiv. 3, "Lift up thy feet unto the *perpetual ruins*." "Lift up thy feet unto the *places permanently desolated*" would express the Revisers' interpretation. But does not the Heb. rather mean "*places long desolated*"?

Isa. lxxv. 20. "For the child shall die an hundred years old, and the sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed." Accurate Hebrew-English again! In any other literature the translator would paraphrase, and save the reader bewilderment. We might render, "For he who dies at a hundred shall be deemed a boy, aye one accursed for sin he who dies at a hundred."

Isa. lxvi. 19, "I will send to Tarshish, Pul and Lud, *that draw the bow*, to Jubal," etc. Who drew the bow? "Lud," "Pul and

Lud," or "Tarshish, Pul and Lud"? The Hebrew reader doubtless knew the people called Lud were noted archers, cf. Jer. xlv. 9. But the English reader does not.

Ps. xiii. 1, "How long wilt thou forget me *for ever*"? Plainly here and elsewhere we are guilty of something like a "bull" in rendering נָסַח literally. "How long wilt thou *not cease to forget me?*" is the meaning. Prov. xxv.

14, "[As] clouds and winds without rain, [so is] he that *boasteth himself of his gifts falsely.*" "Gifts" too often mean with us mental faculties or endowments. Besides it is "a gift" in the Heb. The proverb is aimed at such characters as the generous squire who enriched Parson Adams with imaginary benefices. We might render "[so is] he that *talks much about giving, and lies.*" Ps.

lviii. 9. "*Before your pots can feel the thorns,* He shall take them away with a whirlwind, the green and the burning alike." Does the reader see that here the enemies' abortive plot is likened to a traveller's camp-fire extinguished by a sudden squall? If not, the translator's work is lost. A paraphrase is difficult. But we may at least give "*Before your pots shall feel the heat of the thorn-fagots.*"

Ps. lxxi. 15, "My mouth shall tell of thy righteousness and of thy salvation all the day, for *I know not the numbers thereof.*" This is weak, for who reckons righteousness and salvation in figures? We must render freely, "*I cannot reckon the instances thereof.*" Eccl. i. 15.

"That which is crooked cannot be made straight, and that which is wanting cannot be *numbered,*" i.e. the deficit cannot be put to the credit side of human knowledge. But will not careless readers think the Preacher means, "the things which are wanting are too many to be numbered"? It is better to drop the idiom, and render "That which is lacking cannot be *supplied.*" Eccl. ii. 20.

"Therefore I *turned about to cause* my heart to despair concerning all the labour," etc. Surely the plain sense is

that the Preacher *looked round*, and the result was his heart despaired. Why not express this perspicuously?

Eccl. v. 20 still runs as in A.V. "He shall not much remember the days of his life, because God *answereth him in the joy of his heart*"? We would render here "*answereth him by giving him a joyful heart.*" There is a similar obscure use of this verb in Eccl. x. 19, "and money *answereth all things.*" The Heb. practically means "money *provides everything.*" If literalism be so essential, why not say, "money *answers every purpose*"?

Ps. vi. 3. "My soul also is sore vexed; and thou O Lord, *how long?*" This aposiopesis is common in Hebrew poetry; but surely in English we must finish the sentence somewhat as in P.B.V. "*how long dost thou trouble me?*"

Isa. xlix. 18, is obscurely worded, "Thou shalt surely clothe thee with them all as with an ornament, and gird thyself with them *like a bride.*" "Them" refers to the "children," or Gentile converts of Zion. But it is not meant that a bride girds herself with children. This would rather be said of a matron. Isaiah intends "Thou shalt gird thyself with them, *as a bride girds herself.*" Why not express this signification?

Prov. xxvii. 3, "A stone is heavy, and the sand weighty; but a fool's *vexation* is heavier than them both." Do the Revisers mean the vexation a fool causes, or that by which he victimizes himself? We know not; but are convinced the Hebrew נִצְּרָה means the former. The fool's "vexatiousness" evokes a special poem in Prov. xxvi., and is continually inveighed against. Cf. also Ecclus. xxii. 15, "Sand, and salt, and a mass of iron, are easier to bear than a man without understanding."

Mic. i. 11, "The wailing of Beth-ezel *shall take from you the stay thereof.*" We believe the Revisers understand the passage as we do, but their English is unintelligible. Rend. "the wailing of Beth-ezel *shall be stopped by you.*"

Hab. ii. 17, "The violence done to Lebanon

shall cover thee, and the destruction of the beasts *which made them afraid.*" Of course the reader will think "which" refers to the "beasts." Rend. "*that* destruction" for "*the* destruction," and the sense will be plain.

Zech. ii. 8, "*After glory* hath He sent me unto the nations which spoiled you." "*In quest of glory*" would be more intelligible.

Gen. xviii. 10; 2 Kings iv. 16. The Heb. phrase is here "according to the time living." This means neither more nor less than "*this time next year.*" Why does the R.V. render vaguely "*when the season cometh round*"?

In Eccl. vii. 18 we do not think readers will understand "It is good that thou shouldest take hold of *this*, yea also from *that* withdraw not thine hand," as referring back to vv. 16, 17. Why not say, "*the one*," and "*the other*"? So too in Eccl. xi. 6, in any book but the Bible the translation would be, "Thou knowest not which shall prosper, *the one or the other*," (not "*this or that*"). Again, in Ps. lxxxvii. 4, R.V. gives "Behold Philistia and Tyre with Ethiopia, *this one* was born there." We should substitute "*each of these*," for "*this one.*"

Ps. lxxi. 6. "He shall come down like rain upon the *mown grass.*" The Psalmist means either grass for mowing, or the second crop left to grow after mowing. In the one case we should render "*hay grass*," in the other "*aftermath.*" "*Mown grass*" is probably meant for the latter, but it rather suggests "swathes of mown grass," which (as farmers often sorrowfully testify) are *not* benefited by rain.

A. C. JENNINGS.
W. H. LOWE.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD
TESTAMENT.

IV.

THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY.

i. 1. *Beyond Jordan*. So ver. 5; iii. 8; iv. 41, 46, 47; and before, Num. xxii. 1, xxxv. 14. Exactly the same phrases are used with reference to the country east of Jordan in Josh. xiii. 8; xiv. 3; xvii. 5; Jud. v. 17, etc. It is one of the many indications which combine to show that the Pentateuch is the compilation of an author resident in Palestine. It is sometimes replied, that the phrase "beyond Jordan" may have acquired among the Canaanites a distinct geographical sense (like "Gallia Transalpina," etc.), and have been borrowed from them by the Israelites; but (1) the phrase is no fixed compound, like the Latin term referred to, but is used quite freely, according to the varying position of the speaker (see iii. 25; xi. 30; also, generally, xxx. 13, etc.), and (2) it is improbable that the Israelites would have borrowed a phrase from the Canaanites (especially in the form in which it occurs in Numbers) before they had crossed the Jordan, and experienced the conditions necessary to render its use natural.

The Arábah. An important change, which elucidates many passages: comp. for example, 2 Kings xiv. 25 with Amos vi. 14; and see Josh. iii. 16; viii. 14; xi. 2, 16; 2 Sam. ii. 29, etc. The meaning is explained on the margin. The present name of the Arábah is *El-Ghor* (i.e. the hollow or depression), often named in books of travel.

7. *Lowland*. I.e. the "Shephélah," or maritime plain of the Philistines. See Dean Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, Appendix, § 8; also p. 255 ff. (ed. 1864). Other examples of the same term may be found in Josh. ix. 1; x. 40; xi. 2,

16; Jer. xvii. 26; xxxii. 44, etc. It is one of the many specific geographical terms in which Hebrew abounds.

41. *Were forward.* The word occurs only here in the O.T., but the rendering of the margin is fully corroborated from its use in Arabic.¹ As was often the case with rare words, the tradition as to its meaning was lost by the Jews.

ii. 11, 20. *Rephaim for giants.* The Rephaim are mentioned besides, chap. iii. 11, 13; Gen. xiv. 5; xv. 20; Josh. xii. 4; xiii. 12; xvii. 15; and (in the singular) 2 Sam. xxi. 16, 18, 20 (=1 Chron. xx. 4, 6, 8). There is also the "valley of Rephaim," Josh. xv. 8; Isa. xvii. 5 (and elsewhere). The Rephaim were a race reputed to be of giant stature; though it cannot be said that the word *means* "giants." It denotes the members of a particular race, not (in itself) men of a particular stature.

iii. 10. *Plain or table-land* (margin), the technical geographical term for the high ground east of the Arábah, or depression through which the Jordan flows. See iv. 43; Josh. xiii. 9, 16, 17, 21; 1 Kings xx. 23, 25; Jer. xlviii. 8, 21; Stanley, *l.c.* § 6. In the Authorized Version much confusion was caused by the *Arábah* and the *Mishor*, dissimilar as they were, being often represented indiscriminately by the single word *plain*.

14. *Region for country* (as ver. 4, 13; 1 Kings iv. 13). Another technical expression.

17. *The sea of the Arábah.* This name of the Dead Sea (iv. 49; Josh. iii. 16; Kings xiv. 25), after what has been said on i. 1, will be at once intelligible.

iv. 37. *With his presence.* See Exod. xxxiii. 14, 15. *In his sight* would be לפניו, not בפניו.

v. 10. See on Exod. xx. 6.

vii. 2. *Utterly destroy them.* Heb. devote. Where this verb has a *personal* object, "utterly destroy" has, as a rule,

¹ Qor'an lxxxix. 17 ("My Lord treateth me lightly"); in an adjectival form, xix. 10 ("Easy is this to me").

been left in the text, with "*Heb. devote*" in the margin; in other cases, *devote* has been introduced into the text. The nature and object of the archaic institution, here and elsewhere so often alluded to in the O.T., is perhaps best explained by Ewald in his *Antiquities*, p. 75-8. The Hebrew words rendered *devote* (*heḥ'rīm*) and *devoted thing* (*hērem*) are derived from a root which in Arabic means *to shut off, separate, prohibit* (حَرَمَ *hārama*), whence the *haram* or sacred territory of the Temple of Mecca, and the *harīm*, the secluded apartment of the women, applied also to its occupants, *i.e.* the "harem" (*harim*, حَرِيمٌ).¹ In Israel, as in Moab, the term was used of separation or consecration to a deity. Mesha, in his inscription, tells us how, on the occasion when he carried away the "vessels of Yahweh" from Nebo and presented them before his god Chemosh, he "devoted" 7,000 Israelite prisoners to "Ashtor-Chemosh."² Among the Hebrews the usage was utilized so as to harmonize with the principles of their religion, and to satisfy its needs. It became a mode of secluding or rendering harmless anything which peculiarly imperilled the religious life of either an individual or the community, such objects being withdrawn from society at large and presented to the sanctuary, which had power, if needful, to authorize their destruction. Thus the cities of the Canaanites, with the altars and other religious symbols which they contained, were in this way "devoted" by the ban;³ the spoil of a heathen city was similarly "banned" or "devoted," the whole or a part, according to the gravity of the occasion.⁴ The ban was even put in force against

¹ Also *ḥarām*, "sanctuary"; and *muḥarram*, the sacred (first) month of the Arabs, in which it was forbidden to carry on war.

² Lines 16-18: .שבעת אלפין כי לעשתר כמש החרמ[תי] .ואקח משם .כלי יהוה ויהם לפני כמש .

³ Num. xxi. 2-3; chap. vii. 25-6; xx. 16-18; Josh. x. 28, 40, etc.; 1 Sam. xv. 3, 8, 9, 21.

⁴ Chap. ii. 35; iii. 8; Josh. vi. 17-19 (the whole spoil was here made *hērem*

those within the community itself, who were untrue to its fundamental principles.¹ These cases cover the most frequent instances of its use; but individual human beings (who exhibited irrepressible tendencies towards evil?), and even a field (which had in some way become a snare to its owner? or inspired him with aversion?²) could be “devoted” as well (Lev. xxvii. 28-9³). From this provision, and from the fact that the *hérem* is included among the sources of revenue of the priests,⁴ it may be inferred that, in one form or other, it was once in tolerably frequent operation in ancient Israel. In the A.V. the verb was often rendered “utterly destroy,” and the substantive “accursed thing”; but these terms both express secondary, and (in part) adventitious ideas: by the uniform use in the R.V. of *devote* and *devoted thing*, in the margin, if not in the text, the idea itself is elucidated, and the connexion between the different passages in which the word occurs is preserved.⁵

xi. 21. *As the days of the heavens above the earth*, i.e. as long as they endure in their place; cf. Ps. lxxxix. 29.

24. *The hinder sea*, i.e. the Mediterranean Sea; so

or “devoted”; a part of this *hérem* was afterwards secreted by Achan, as it was reserved by Saul on a similar occasion, 1 Sam. xv.; viii. 2, 26.

¹ Exod. xxii. 20; Deut. xiii. 12-17 (the idolatrous city); Judg. xxi. 10 f.

² The application of the *hérem* in these cases is remarkable, and we can only supply the motives which may have then prompted resort to it by conjecture.

³ A thing *consecrated* could be commuted for a money-payment; had this been permitted with the thing “devoted,” the aim of the institution would have been obviously frustrated.

⁴ Num. xviii. 14; Ezek. xlv. 29.

⁵ In illustration of the usage generally, Knobel (on Lev. xxvii. 29) compares the description given by Cæsar (*B. G.*, vi. 17) of the custom of the ancient Gauls: “ . . . Martem bella regere. Huic, cum prælio dimicare constituerunt, ea quæ bello ceperint, plerumque devovent. Quæ superaverint, animalia capta immolant; reliquas res in unum conferunt. Multis in civitatibus harum rerum exstructos tumulos locis consecratis conspiciari licet: neque sæpe accidit, ut neglecta quispiam religione aut capta apud se occultare aut posita tollere auderet, gravissimumque ei rei supplicium cum cruciatu constitutum est.” But the distinctive feature in the Hebrew institution, so far as it was applied in warfare, is, that it was not captured spoil, as such, that was “devoted,” but objects, or persons, opposed to the spirit of Israel’s religion.

xxxiv. 2; Joel ii. 20; Zech. xiv. 8. The expression is analogous to the use of *right-hand* to denote the South (Ps. lxxxix. 12, al.: cf. the Indian *Deccan*), and of קֶדֶם, *front*, for the East, and implies that those who framed it conceived themselves as naturally turning towards the East.

xiii. 13. *Base fellows*. "Belial" is not a proper name in Hebrew, but a word signifying worthlessness. "*Sons* (or, elsewhere, *men*) of worthlessness," is an expression denoting base or worthless fellows. The time-honoured rendering has, however, in some instances, been retained, but not without the true meaning being indicated on the margin (Judg. xix. 22; 1 Sam. i. 16; ii. 12, etc.). The same word occurs chap. xv. 19, where the Hebrew literally is "Beware lest there be a word in thine heart, (even) worthlessness."¹

xvi. 15. *Keep a feast for keep a solemn feast*. The adjective suggests a distinction, which does not exist in the Hebrew, between this and other feasts. The word is precisely the same as in Exod. xxiii. 14, the usual one denoting the observance of a "*hāg*" (see on Lev. xxiii. 2).

xviii. 15, 18. *prophet for Prophet*. The limitation to Christ which is a natural inference from the capital letter is excluded by the context. The legislator is giving a reason why the Israelites need not, like their neighbours (Isa. ii. 6), cultivate the arts of divination: they are differently circumstanced from them (ver. 14); as occasion demands, a prophet will be raised up² to give them the instruction which they require, and a criterion is assigned (ver. 20-22) enabling them to distinguish the true prophet from the false. The expression is here meant generically. It may be granted that it *includes* a reference to the ideal prophet, Christ; but the context shows that it must not be so interpreted as to *exclude* the series of prophets, who were in Israel the permanent source of revelation and in-

¹ Construction by apposition, as xvi. 21; Prov. xxii. 21; Jer. x. 10.

² Cf. for the expression Judg. ii. 16, 18 f.

struction, and a genuine mark of distinction between it and other nations of antiquity.¹

xix. 6. *Used the fruit thereof.* The word used here and xxviii. 30 (also Jer. xxxi. 5, where see margin) means properly *to treat as common* (lit. *as profane*).

xx. 19. *For is the tree, etc.* So LXX. : also Onkelos and the Peshitto (except that they substitute the negative *is not* for the interrogative), and modern scholars generally, although the rendering implies a change in the Massoretic vocalization (הָאֵדָם for הָאֵדָם). The expression at the end of the verse is the usual one for *being besieged* (lit. *to enter into siege*) ; e.g. 2 Kings xxv. 2.

xxi. 4. *A valley with running water for a rough valley.* The presence of water was essential to the symbolism of the transaction (ver. 6). אֵיתָן is another example of a word of which the true meaning was lost by the Jews, who endeavoured unsuccessfully to recover it from the context (usually they guessed *strong* ; here *rough*). When Arabic was studied it was found to be an intensive² form from a root signifying *to be unfailing* or *constant*, specially applied to water. In the East, the *wadys* or torrent-beds are often dry in summer ; the נַחַל אֵיתָן is a stream which flows perpetually.³ The use of the word in Hebrew where it is applied to streams or water is now clear (Amos v. 24 ; Exod. xiv. 27 [see margin] ; Ps. lxxiv. 15). Elsewhere it is applied metaphorically in the sense of permanent, fixed, enduring (Gen. xlix. 24 ; Num. xxiv. 21 ; Jer. v. 15). In some of these passages *mighty* or *in strength* sufficiently represents the idea to English ears, but does not express the true sense of the original.

xxix. 19. *To destroy the moist with the dry.* Apparently a proverbial expression denoting *all*. The words are

¹ Compare Oehler, § 161 ; Orelli, *Old Test. Prophecy*, § 17, etc.

² Technically an "elative" ; used in Arabic to express the comparative and superlative degree, but in Hebrew preserved only in three or four isolated words.

³ Opp. to the אֵתָן (a word of the same form), the "*deceitful brook*" of Jer. xv. 18 (see Job vi. 15).

feminine in the Hebrew ; so that they must refer primarily either to the land, or to non-personal things generally.

26. Heb. *divided*. See iv. 19.

xxxi. 10. *Set time for solemnity*. The same word which has been explained on Lev. xxiii. 2.

xxxii. 5. *They are not*, etc. The Hebrew is unusually elliptical ; and there is little doubt that the text is corrupt. So far as a sense can be extracted from it, it is contained in the alternatives offered by the R.V., the text expressing the sense that the corruption of the degenerate Israelites, whose ingratitude forms the subject of the Song, is a blemish on them ; the margin, that they are not the true children, or "sons," of Jehovah (chap. xiv. 1), but a blot upon them (viz. upon the true children). But the words cannot be said in strictness to constitute an intelligible Hebrew sentence.

11. *He spread*, etc. It seems preferable to treat ver. 11 as complete in itself (omitting *So* in ver. 12), inasmuch as in ver. 12 a *new* feature ("alone") is emphasized, which is not prominent in ver. 11. The *tertium comparationis* in ver. 11 is evidently the *manner* in which the eagle cares for its young, not the fact that it *alone* cares for them.

17. *Demons for devils*. Hebrew *Shedim*, only besides in Ps. cvi. 37. The precise nature of the ideas associated with "Shedim" is uncertain, the allusions in the O.T. being not sufficient to fix them decisively. In Assyrian¹ *shedu* is a name of the divinities represented by the bull-colossi, being applied apparently not to gods properly so-called, but to subordinate spirits, supposed to be invested with power for good or evil. Etymologically the word may

¹ Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the O.T.*, ad loc. : vol. i. p. 148 in the English translation (London, 1885) ; see also p. 40. The feelings with which the *shedi* were regarded in Assyria may be illustrated from the invocation of an Assyrian king (Lenormant, *Les Origines de l'Histoire*, i. p. 114) : "In this palace may the gracious *shedu*, the gracious colossus, guardian of the steps of my majesty, continue his presence always," etc.

be derived from the root represented in Arabic by *مَسَّ*, to be lord, to domineer¹ (whence the Spanish *Cid*, i.e. lord). In Syriac the corresponding word *ܡܣܝܚ*^o_x stands regularly in the N.T. for *δαίμων* and *δαιμόνια*; but this usage is not *conclusive* as to the ideas associated, long previously, with the Hebrew *shedim*. The LXX. use in both places *δαιμόνια*: and it is on the whole most probable that some kind of demi-god, or subordinate spirit, was denoted by the word, though we cannot define more closely the attributes or character belonging to them.

24. *Crawling things*. The term is peculiar, and recurs Micah vii. 17.

27. *Provocation*. *Wrath* is incorrect. The word *פַּעַם* always denotes the sense of vexation or chagrin, aroused by unmerited treatment. See Job v. 2; vi. 2; Prov. xxvii. 3; and with the verb, ver. 21 (where it is rendered, as often, "provoked to anger," but expresses strictly the vexation caused by the preference shown towards false gods); 1 Sam. i. 6, and in the often recurring phrases, 1 Kings xiv. 9, 15; xv. 30; xvi. 13, etc.

Misdeem, i.e. not recognise the truth, *lit.* treat it as strange.

36. *And there is none remaining, shut up or left at large*. A proverbial expression denoting *all*. It has been differently explained; but most probably means, either both the imprisoned and the released, or both bond and free. It recurs 1 Kings xiv. 10; xxi. 21; 2 Kings ix. 8 (where the A.V. was obscure, describing, apparently, as one class, what in reality formed two); xiv. 26. Comp. the expressions in xxix. 19; Mal. ii. 6; Job xii. 16. Gesenius, in his *Thesaurus*, pp. 1004 and 1008, cites examples of similar proverbial phrases from the Arabic.

xxxiii. 2. *Fiery law*, with margin. The word rendered

¹ From which it would be a normal participial formation, like *עָרַב* from *עָרַב*, *עָרַב* from *עָרַב*, etc.

law (דָּת) is not the usual Hebrew word for "law" (תּוֹרָה) but is of Persian origin, occurring besides only in some of the latest books of the O. T. (Ezra, Esther, Daniel). It is difficult to suppose that such a word can have found its way into Hebrew, at the period when this Blessing was composed, and hence the second alternative on the margin, which is obtained by treating the two words for *fire* and *law* as one (for דָּת אֵשׁ reading אֵשֶׁת); the word thus obtained would be derived from a root well known in Aramaic in the sense of *pour out*, and it occurs itself in Hebrew in the sense of *slopes* or *springs* (chap. iii. 17; iv. 49). The figure may be illustrated from Judg. v. 4 f.; Ps. lxxviii. 8; Micah i. 4. But the writer must allow that this reading (and rendering) appears to him to be highly precarious and uncertain; and he prefers to suppose that there is some deep-seated error in the text.

xxxiii. 3. The change of pronoun, from *his* to *they*, in *one clause*, is so harsh that the rendering of the margin (which is that of Onkelos and Saadyah), referring the pronoun to Israel, appears preferable. Throughout this passage the text is very hard; the word rendered *sat down* occurs nowhere else, and cannot be satisfactorily explained, even with the aid of the cognate languages. For "(are) in thy hand" (בִּידֶךָ), the Syriac translators read *blesseth* (בִּרְךָ).

6. *Yet let his men be few.* The blessing is a qualified one, and corresponds with the position actually taken by Reuben in the history. The tribe maintained its existence, but was not politically important. It is reproached by Deborah (Jud. v. 15, 16 R.V.) for deliberating, but arriving at no decision, in a great national crisis; and many of the cities assigned to it in the "table-land," E. of Jordan (Num. xxxii. 37 f.; Josh. xiii. 15-21), appear afterwards (see the Inscription of Mesha, and Isa. xv.-xvi.) in the possession of Moab. The rendering of R.V. is that which is required by Hebrew

usage. Where a verse (or clause) is divided into two members of equal weight, a negative standing in the first may extend its influence over the second; but a negative holding a *subordinate* place in the first member does not, and indeed, upon logical grounds, cannot, affect the sense of the second. Thus in Ps. ix. 18; xxxv. 19; xxxviii. 1; xlv. 18; lxxv. 5; 1 Sam. 2, 3a, the *not* of the first member rules the sense of the second; but here the principal clause in the first member is *Let Reuben live*, the words *and not die* being added merely for the purpose of emphasizing this;¹ the first member of the verse, therefore, so far from supplying a negative to determine the second, in reality contains only an *affirmative* proposition. If, in order to gain the negative legitimately, we divide the verse thus:

“Let Reuben live:

“And let him not die, neither let his men be few,”
it is evident that the rhythm is entirely destroyed.

17. *The firstling of his bullock, majesty is his*, i.e. Ephraim, whom Joseph treated as his firstborn (Gen. xlviii. 18), the allusion being to the power which, in its flourishing days, the Northern kingdom possessed (Amos vi. 13; Hos. xiii. 1; Isa. ix. 9, 10).

21. *For there was the lawgiver's portion reserved*. The passage is difficult. The text is understood to mean that Gad received the portion assigned to him by Moses (Num. xxxii. 16 ff.); the margin, that Gad, from the bravery which it displayed as leader in the conquest of Canaan (see the next clauses) received the portion due to a ruler or leader in such an enterprise. For מְהֻלָּק in the sense of *ruler*, see Jud. v. 14, where it is rendered *governor*, and appears to denote similarly the holder of some military office.

22. *That leapeth forth*. It is the lion's whelp, not Dan, which has its home in the caves and thickets of

¹ Cf. Ps. xxviii. 5b; and often in Jeremiah (ii. 27; xviii. 7; xxi. 10; xxiv. 6; xlii. 10).

Bashan, whence it "leaps forth" upon the unwary traveller.

27. *Thrust...said.* The tenses in the original are past, not future.

28. *Alone*, in parallelism with "in safety," *i.e.* remote from all assailants. So Micah vii. 14; Ps. iv. 8 *margin*.

xxxiv. 3. *Plain.* See on Gen. xiii. 10.

xxxiv. 6. The rendering on the margin is in accordance with Hebrew idiom, the subject to be understood being the cognate participle (xvii. 6; xxii. 8) הִקְבֵּר, the sense may then be represented in English either by the passive verb or by the indefinite *they*. See 1 Sam. xxiii. 22 (*it is told*; Heb. אָמַר sc. הָאָמַר); 1 Kings xiii. 9; xxii. 38 (וַיִּשְׁטַף); 2 Kings xxi. 26 (same word as here); Isa. liii. 9 R.V. (*And they made*).

THE BOOK OF JOSHUA.

iii. 16. *At.* So the Heb. text. *From* is the correction on the Heb. margin, and is the reading of Targ., Pesh. Vulg. (implied also in LXX.—σφόδρα σφοδρῶς pre-supposing the consonants [ם] מֵאֵד מֵאֵד).

iv. 24. *They* for *ye*. If the יִרְאֶתֶם be meant for the past tense (which elsewhere in this verb is always יִרְאֶתֶם) the punctuation cannot be correct, the construction of a final conjunction *in order that* with such a tense being incredible.¹ The punctuation followed in the R.V. is יִרְאֶתֶם—the infinitive, as often after לִמְעַן.

v. 13. Chapter vi. should begin here; vi. 2 is the continuation of v. 15.

vi. 17–vii. 26. By the consistent use of *devote* and *devoted* in the text, or (vi. 18, 21; vii. 12) in the margin, the meaning

¹ Whether here, or Jer. xxiii. 14; xxvii. 18 (read either יִשְׁבוּ and יָבֹאוּ or שׁוּב and בּוֹא).

and connexion of the whole narrative is greatly elucidated. See on Deut. vii. 2.

vii. 21. *Margin.* On Shinar, see Gen. x. 10; xi. 2; Dan. i. 2; also Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the O. T.*, p. 103.

viii. 32. The reference to Deuteronomy shows that the "stones" here mentioned are not, as a superficial reader might conclude, those spoken of in ver. 31 (for unhewn stones would afford an unsuitable surface for an inscription), but other stones, prepared for the purpose, as here described.

ix. 4. *Margin.* הַצִּמְרִי for הַצִּמְרִי.

xi. 1, 16. The geographical terms, as Deut. i. 1, 7, etc.

xii. 2. *Margin.* See also Josh. xiii. 9, 16. The word rendered *valley* (נַחַל) has the same meaning as the Arabic *wady*, and is applied indiscriminately to the torrent itself, or the valley through which it runs.

xiii. 2. *Regions.* The same distinctive expression recurs, Joel iii. 4; also, of a district about Jordan, chap. xxii. 10, 11; cf. Ezek. xlvii. 8.

xiii. 3. *Margin.* Add chap. xv. 4, 47; 1 Kings viii. 65; 2 Kings xxiv. 7; Isa. xxvii. 12, where the same torrent is alluded to as forming the border between the territory of Israel and Egypt. It is called the Shihor again in 1 Chron. xiii. 5. Its present name is the Wady-el-Arish. In Isa. xxiii. 3; Jer. ii. 18, however, Shihor is used to denote the Nile.

Chapters xv.-xxi. In these chapters numerous small changes will be noticed, the effect of which is to render the topographical descriptions more precise and distinct.

xix. 29. *Margin.* The same expression for Tyre recurs 2 Sam. xxiv. 7.

xx. 7. *Margin* (strictly "*the Galil*"). The word appears to mean properly *circuit* or *district*, being the masculine, of which the feminine is rendered "*region*" in xiii. 2. The district meant was a part of Naphtali on the frontiers of

Palestine, in which apparently many foreigners, especially Sidonians, had settled; hence called (Isa ix. 1 [viii. 23 Heb.]) "the District of the nations," and, more briefly, "the Galil," as here and xxi. 32; 1 Kings ix. 11 ("the land of the Galil"); 2 Kings xv. 29.

xxii. 11. *In the forefront of for over against.* The Hebrew preposition implies that the altar was on the same side of Jordan as the land of Canaan: ¹ comp. viii. 33, where it is rendered *in front of* (i.e. on the slopes of), not on the mountain opposite, as "over against" seemed to suggest.

24. *Carefulness for fear.* The word denotes anxiety, concern; 1 Sam. ix. 5 ("take thought for,"—not "caring"); Ps. xxxviii. 11 ("sorry"); Ezek. iv. 16; xii. 18 f.

ERRATUM.

In the notes on Exodus, p. 83, lines 4 and 5, the words *hawah* and *hayah* should exchange places.

S. R. DRIVER.

MESSIANIC PSALMS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

LUKE i. 42-45, 46-55, 68-79; ii. 29-32.

WE could ask no more striking indication of the essential unity of the old and new dispensations, or of the Old and New Testaments, than is furnished by the fact that the line of division between the one pair is not coincident with that between the other. The New Testament begins before the old dispensation closes. The first pages of the Gospels are the concluding records of the old economy. The first verses of Mark are immediately consecutive to the last of Malachi. Matthew introduces the history of Jesus after exactly the same fashion in which Genesis introduces the

¹ See the note of W. Aldis Wright in the *Cambridge Journal of Philology*, xiii. pp. 117-120.

history of Abraham (Gen. xi. 10 *seq.*). The beginnings of Luke and of 1 Samuel are not only one in spirit, but also one in form. John opens his account of the new creation in words closely parallel with those in which Moses opens his account of the first creation. These connexions are not accidental. Taken separately, they are deeply significant of the characteristic features of each Gospel. Taken together, they vividly illustrate the unity of the two Testaments.

The resemblances of form extend even to details. The pious Elkanah and his devout but childless wife were the types of Zacharias and Elizabeth. The sanctuary, with its solemn worship, was the scene of both promises. The joy of both fulfilments blossomed forth with songs of praise to God. The declaration that "the child Samuel grew on, and was in favour both with the Lord, and also with men" (1 Sam. ii. 26), finds its counterpart concerning John in Luke i. 80, and especially concerning Jesus, in the double statements of Luke ii. 40 and 52; proving to us that the human development of this child was just like that of John or of Samuel. But the likeness of spirit is even deeper. The reader of the earlier portions of the Gospels feels himself still on Old Testament ground; and it is among the characteristic scenes of Old Testament life, and specifically Old Testament circles of thought that he is asked to move. It required the three years of Christ's public ministry, culminating in His death and rising again, to sweep all this away for ever, and fix a great gulf between this new and that old, which all the centuries since Malachi had left essentially unaltered—proving to us that this teacher was not a native product of the soil in which he grew. Approaching them from this point of view, we are not surprised to find the canticles that are embedded in this portion of the narrative, redolent of the old economy. In form, manner, matter, spirit, they are indistinguishable from the "Praise-songs

of Israel" that constituted the hymn-book of the ancient Church; and it was a true instinct which led some scribes of the LXX. and the earliest printers to attach them to the Psalter.

That they exhibit all the characteristics of Hebrew poetry in their structure, lies on their face. The parallelism of members, the arrangement of strophes, the regular beat of the accent, are not only discoverable, but prominent. Even that one of them the character of which has been least insisted upon—the Salutation of Elizabeth (Luke i. 42-45)—is unmistakably verse, even elaborately and artistically verse. Beginning with short lines of three beats of the accent each, the first strophe closes with a longer line of four, while the second strophe continues with this longer line, to close, itself, with a still longer line of five tones. The song thus happily combines the art of the fine ode in Exodus xv.—where the four-toned lines culminate at the end of the strophe in one of five tones—and that of the twenty-third Psalm, much of the beauty of which is due to the gradual lengthening of the lines in each succeeding strophe, leaving on the reader's mind the sense of increasing satisfaction in Jehovah's goodness. The effect of this arrangement in our present case is to erect verse 43 into the climax of the first strophe, and verse 45 into the lingering climax of the whole song:—

“Blessed | art thou | among women !

And blessed | the fruit | of thy womb !

And whence to me | is this :—

That the mother | of my Lord | should come | unto me ?
For lo, as came | the voice | of thy greeting | into my ears,
Leaped | in rejoicing | the babe | in my womb :—
And happy | is she that believed | that fulfilment shall be |
to what was told her | from the Lord.”

When read thus in accordance with its structure, this beautiful canticle is seen to be a celebration of Mary's

faith, in believing that "there should be fulfilment to what was spoken to her from the Lord;" and, as leading up to this, every part of it takes its proper subordinate place. This faith, astounding in itself, the most supreme example probably of perfect trust in God and absolute self-devotion to Him and His will that human flesh has ever given, was all the more striking to Elizabeth on account of its contrast with the unbelief of her own husband under a far less severe trial. No wonder that when Mary appeared before her Spirit-illuminated eyes (ver. 41) she seemed the embodiment of Faith—that modest Virgin with clasped hands, whom Hermas saw in vision, through whom the elect of God are saved, and from whom spring all the Christian graces as fair daughters of a fair mother. Mary is, thus, in Elizabeth's eyes the most blessed of women, because the most faithful; and it suits well that the first Psalm of the New Testament should take the form of a praise of the fundamental evangelical virtue.

The excitement which the commentators see in this Psalm, we find it somewhat difficult to recognise. It was a glad shout (ver. 42), but its joyful cry is more like a pæan over a victory already accomplished than the excited and exciting call to an onset. Rapid in its movement it no doubt is, and full of the rush and life of a stream in the mountains. In this, Mary's answering song is in strong contrast with it. This is the same stream flowing with deep and tranquil waters through the rich lowlands. Dr. Godet thinks that this greater calmness is the mirror of greater happiness; certainly it is the reflection of deeper spiritual life, born of experience both of sorrow and of God's strength for consolation. All through Israel's history such songs had been sung; and had we met with the *Magnificat* in the midst of the Psalter—say somewhere about the thirtieth, or ninety-eighth, or one hundred and third, or one hundred and eleventh Psalm—it would have occasioned no

surprise and seemed in no sense out of place. But such songs were never sung in Israel save in the night season—a night season for the nation and a night season for the singer. The ploughmen must plough the back and make long their furrows (Psalm cxxix. 3) before so richly golden a harvest can mature—before the assured conviction can grow so stout in the heart, that Jehovah is righteous, and will cut asunder the cords of the wicked, and put to shame all the enemies of Zion. When Mary uttered those words of such sweet and humble sublimity—"Behold the bond-maid of the Lord; be it unto me according to Thy word"—she at once received the rankling sword-thrust into her soul, and steeped her soul in a balm that healed and more than healed all possible sword-thrusts. Here we see the rich fruitage of her faith. Yet how little there is of the personal in her Psalm! If it were not for the feminine form of the word "servant" in verse 48, it might have been written for all that appears on the surface by any Korahite at any time since the opening of the Psalter. It is Elizabeth who sings the praise of Mary's faith; Mary answers by a praise of God—His grace, might, mercy, justice, and faithfulness. The difference is significant—perhaps characteristic.

In poetical structure the *Magnificat* is framed quite after the model of the older *T'hilloth*. There are four strophes of four lines each (verses 46-48, 49-50, 51-53, 54-55), and the movement of the thought advances regularly through them, gradually increasing in animation until the climax is reached in the third, and "the song drops down to its nest again in the fourth, which is as it were, the Amen of the canticle." The tone of the whole is happy though solemn—such as befitted one so highly honoured and yet so unconscious of self. When we are asked to observe the royal character impressed upon it, we can see it only through a mist darkly. It needed no descendant of kings to magnify the Lord for overturning the proud and elevating the lowly

in fulfilment of His promise to Abraham. The absence of all mention of David, and the turning of hope rather to the promise to Abraham, is noticeable on the contrary part; and almost strange after the angelic words (ver. 32)—“The Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David.” Elizabeth (ver. 43) and Zacharias (ver. 69) thought more of the royalty of the Coming One than Mary; her heart was occupied with God’s mercy in sending Him. This, too, is probably characteristic.

On the other hand, the prevailing priestly character of Zacharias’ hymn is somewhat strongly marked. It would have been natural to no one but a priest to cast his Messianic hopes so prevailingly in the moulds of the sanctuary. Just as the *Magnificat* takes up the theme with which Elizabeth ended, and recounts the great things that Mary believes will flow from what God has spoken to her, so the *Benedictus* begins where Mary ends—with the faithfulness of God to His promises; and it is only after praising Him through three rich strophes, conceived and expressed quite in Old Testament form, for His fulfilment of them, that he can turn to add two more for the outpouring of his joy over the part given his own son in the saving work. Even then, the so-long-expected son is mentioned only briefly and as it were by the way, to give rise to a renewed burst of praise to God for His mercy to Israel. Here, too, the personal is sunk in the national and religious; or say, rather, the lower personal in the higher personal. Zacharias’ mind is full of God’s glory; of his son, only as the promise of coming brightness, the faint gleam preceding the Day-spring from on high. Even the swan-song of Symeon is of essential Old Testament type, and only supplies us with a *T’hillah* to set over against our three *T’hilloth*. When we open Luke’s Gospel, therefore, and read these stirring lyrics, we feel no break with Israel’s whole past. Only, as in the times of Moses, and of David, and of Jehoshaphat, and of Nehemiah,

so now again, when the Lord once more visits His people, their response breaks forth anew, and the harps which had been so long hanging upon the willows are tuned afresh to celebrate the new deliverance.

And if this is true of their outer, no less is it true of their innermost characteristics; in the Messianic hopes which they express, they belong as thoroughly to the old dispensation as they do in their structure and general tone. There is deeply stamped upon them the impress of the period in which the hope of redemption was national, and salvation belonged especially to Israel. They are oblivious also of the whole space of time that was to intervene between the coming of the Messiah and the consummation of His kingdom. This markedly Old Testament standpoint would have been impossible after our Lord had begun His public work, much more after His death and resurrection. The joyful expectation of Elizabeth is damped by no anticipated sorrow. Mary sings of the impending establishment of the reign of righteousness with perfect frankness and no misgivings. Zacharias celebrates the re-erected theocracy and the universal peace as if already at hand. Only Symeon has a wider outlook beyond the nation, and a deeper hint of a ministry of suffering, but goes in neither matter beyond Old Testament warrant, or indeed beyond Old Testament words. In this we have a valuable witness to the genuineness of the canticles—which otherwise would be an incredible *post eventum contra eventum*. In only one respect do they sharply separate themselves from their companions in the Psalter: they represent the time of God's promised intervention as already come, and the agents in introducing the kingdom as actually present. It is just because Mary is the mother of the promised one that Elizabeth pronounces her blessed: Elizabeth's babe, though yet unborn, has already begun his life-work of pointing to the Messiah—already gives his witness that He that cometh after him is greater

than he. The ground of Mary's praise to God is, that in spite of her low estate, He has selected her as the vessel of His election for bringing the seed of Abraham into the world, and this is the mighty, holy, just and faithful thing that He has done which commands her song. It is the momentous fact that the predicted forerunner who should prepare the way before Jehovah's face, is before his eyes, that inspires Zacharias to sing the faithfulness of God in fulfilling His oath of redemption. And Symeon's watch is over only because the Salvation of God lies in his aged arms. This is the outstanding development from the end of the Old Testament to the beginning of the New—a development that hangs upon the unnoted passage of time, and the gradual unfolding of God's purpose of redemption in act.

Whether there be along with this, any corresponding advance in the clearness with which Messiah's person and work are revealed, needs close scrutiny to discover. It was God's way to precede every development of His plan in history, with a preparatory revelation; and it is because a new step in history is to be now taken that the inspiring Spirit once more appears in Israel. But will this justify us in too confidently expecting advance in revelation beyond the great advance in the definition of the time as already arrived—the announcement that the fulness of time has come? The careful student will at all events soon observe that, this eliminated, not a word remains in any of the four songs which might not have been spoken equally well before the close of the Old Testament canon—the counterpart of which does not occur in the Old Testament records.

The discovery of this fact, however, does not quite determine the question before us. The very same words may be fraught with very different meanings at widely different times. And this is of the essence especially of prophecy, and is a necessary quality of any revelation intended as a message to more than a single generation. Just as the

sacred writers so write of physical fact—as for instance in the opening chapter of Genesis—as to be seen so soon as the knowledge of scientific truth has grown among men, to presuppose a deeper knowledge than any of their readers possessed for some thousands of years, and yet so speak as to convey their special moral message to the men of their own time without clogging their understanding by teaching them science before the time of science; so, the sacred prophecies are so framed as to presuppose much more than is apparent to men of the generation of their delivery, but which becomes progressively plainer from age to age with advancing knowledge of the things prophesied, and thus carry in their bosom a message for all time in ever-growing definiteness and richness. This is mere fact; and so far from opposing the strictly scientific exposition of the prophecies, is the inevitable fruit of it. They cannot be made by a severe grammatical exegesis to bear another character.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

(*To be concluded*)

BLAISE PASCAL.¹

It has often been said of the celebrated Frenchman, on whose life and writings the following remarks are made, that he was more praised than read. There is certainly great truth in the remark, owing probably to the comparatively limited amount of his literary efforts, and the early period at which his career terminated. He was, however, a transcendent genius, one of the most sublime spirits of the world, as Bayle in his Dictionary says of him, and it is impossible to study his character without admiration and profit. It presented a combination of qualities seldom found together, as well as some striking con-

¹ The substance of this paper was originally delivered as a Lecture in Edinburgh.

trasts and contradictions. Famous as he became for what he did, he becomes to the student, looking back through two hundred years, almost more remarkable for the evidence which he gave of what he might have done, had his life been prolonged.

He died at the age of thirty-nine. He was from his birth of sickly constitution—never able to take an active share in the more robust avocations of his companions. For his short manhood, he lived for the most part a dreamy, self-absorbed life, without worldly ambition, and without any definite object; yet he left behind him a name in physical science brilliant enough to excite the jealousy of Des Cartes, and a reputation in French literature unique and unapproached in its style—a style which roused the admiration of Voltaire and Racine, and which is still accounted a model in French literary composition.

Yet the works which gained for him his literary fame were but two: the first, a series of controversial and in their nature ephemeral letters against the Jesuits, called forth by the passing events of the day; and, secondly, a collection of detached reflections on religion and ethics, the result of his meditations for many years on men and systems, which had never been reduced into any methodical shape, and were found after his death among his papers. These last were written for the most part on loose sheets and scraps of paper, without revision or plan, although they were certainly intended to form part of a large and systematic treatise which, however, he never lived to complete. The first of these are the celebrated *Provincial Letters*; and the second have long been celebrated under the name of *Pascal's Pensées*.

He was at the end of his career a recluse, and in the latter part of it he was an ascetic also, although he was not under vows. Indeed, it seems clear enough that towards the close of his life, in addition to the discomforts

of failing health, he subjected himself to self-inflicted pain. Yet this man was thoroughly a man of the world, who knew and understood it well. When he comes to pour out his thoughts regarding it, which he does in the second of those works, it is not as a mere moralist, standing apart, and wondering at the folly of a world he never entered. He knew it well, and although probably never conquered by its temptations, he lived for some time in its most fascinating circles. It was probably in that school that Pascal learned his polished wit, his delicate irony, his power of insinuating a humorous thought, which he played so adroitly around the heads of his imaginary antagonists in the *Provincial Letters*. There, also, he may have acquired the subtle sense of the grotesque which seasons them throughout, and that thorough knowledge of social man and his ways of which he draws so powerful a picture in the work entitled his *Thoughts*. Although latterly he withdrew from the world, it was not with the bitterness of a misanthrope, but the kindly pity of a Christian, who had grown wiser. Knowing his own, he felt no scorn of the weaknesses of others; but he dissects them with the scalpel of the philosopher, laying bare the inmost recesses, the nerves and arteries, the motives and springs of action, with the operation of which he had been long conversant. He united the most complete, although apparently unconscious, intellectual assent to the views of the leaders of the Reformation, as regards the more fundamental doctrines of evangelical Christianity, with extreme and even bitter dislike of the Reformation itself, and of all concerned in promoting it. Calvin, more especially, he never mentions without acerbity. While he exposed, and indeed scared from the light of day, the casuistry of the Jesuits, he yet held tenaciously to the doctrine of the real presence, to confession and penance, to there being no salvation outside of the Church of which the Pope was the head,

to modern miracles, to the efficacy or merit of monastic asceticism, and many other Roman Catholic dogmas which are disowned by evangelical Protestant theology.

The question, therefore, which we propose to consider in a few pages is, whence the interest his reputation has always created in the evangelical Churches of Christendom. At the root there lies, undoubtedly, his thorough faith in and acceptance of the gospel scheme of salvation, and his example of strong personal devotion. But these were in him consistently united to an unusual force of character. It is this combination which has deservedly given him his influence and fame. Thus these anonymous pamphlets, thrown off while the author was comparatively young, on a subject which chanced to engage the attention of the French public at the time, along with some scattered reflections, jotted down from time to time, on life and on the Christian religion, and not prepared for publication, have been translated into every language in Europe, and have handed down his name in unbroken lustre to the present day.

Both his character and his attainments present many remarkable features, and are well worthy of deliberate study. In some respects, the moral elements were at apparent variance with each other, as is frequently the case in minds of unusual force and originality. He was undoubtedly in the end a man of very deep religious impressions, but these were united with a fiery temperament—sometimes developing not only strong feeling, but even jealousy or rancour. Thus there are two persons to whom, throughout his *Thoughts*, he constantly refers. One was Montaigne, for whose writings and cast of thought he had an almost morbid aversion. The other was the great philosopher, Des Cartes, a friend of his father, who at first was greatly struck with the unusual aptitude of the boy, but at length undoubtedly looked upon him with

distaste. St. Beuve says of him, in his work on Port Royal (ii. p. 462): "In general, Descartes appears, from some indications in his letters, to have regarded the young Pascal, who was a geometrician, and a physicist, with that vigilance, that restless observation, and jealousy of his own rights, which one might use, beforehand, to a growing rival, and a possible successor, already dangerous."¹ The same author says, a little too strongly: "Pascal, during all his life, and in all his works, did, and wished to do, only two things; to fight the Jesuits to the death, in the *Provincials*, and to ruin and annihilate Montaigne in the *Pensées*" (ii. p. 398).

He had many other qualities which are rarely combined. He was eminent both in physics and dialectics. He knew—no one more thoroughly—the value of scientific research in its strength and in its weakness. He never allowed a theory to do duty for a demonstration, or a metaphor to be paraded to conceal a fallacy; and although he points out in the *Pensées* that the mathematical mind is not in general logical and consecutive when it wanders into ethics, there is no evidence of such a fault in his lucid pages. He is equally a master in both styles. Neither in his writings are there found any traces of morbid excitement, although there was such an element in his character. Indeed, in these northern climes, we can hardly appreciate the fervid ebullition and rapidity of a mind like Pascal's. From this cause arise those apparent inconsistencies of which we have spoken; but when he comes to reason, his logic bears no trace of heat or passion. Nothing can be more thoroughly tinged with good sense and quiet experience, than his views of life—social, religious, public. His ethical views are distinguished by strong, vivid, practical power, and he separates the real from the conventional with the hand of a master,

¹ *Port Royal*, par C. A. Sainte Beuve. Paris, 1878.

and tears away from the realities of life the veil which pride, selfishness, and custom combine to cast over them.

Such in a general view was this man who died before his fame was at its maturity, and who, during his short life, was encumbered by the feeblest of physical frames, and who composed under the tortures of bodily pain. It is no wonder that the eyes of Europe, especially of religious and literary Europe, should have been turned towards him with admiration ever since his death. He was not a Protestant; he was a Roman Catholic. If he had much in common with the evangelical Churches, he held many adverse opinions. His monastic life cannot be held up as an example to be praised, but rather as one to be lamented. Still with it all he was a sublime genius, well worthy to be held in remembrance.

The biography of his early life, his parentage and associations, are too well known to require to be recapitulated here. He was born in 1623. His father was a man of distinction and intelligence, and was surrounded in his day by all that was best in the ability and wit of France. His son, Blaise Pascal, was distinguished from the first by his precocious proficiency. He taught himself geometry when only a boy, and his progress in natural science was one of the most remarkable traits of his remarkable mind. It was much later in his life, comparatively speaking, that any strong religious impulse actuated him. But in the dawn of his inventive mind he was devoted to experiments in natural philosophy. As we have said, Des Cartes had been attracted by the precocity of the lad's power, but in the end their intimacy came to an open rupture. It seems that Des Cartes had accused Pascal of taking credit for a work on conic sections, which was truly composed by his father. This paper, which Pascal wrote at the age of seventeen, created a considerable amount of interest among the men of science then in Paris. Des Cartes was one of that circle,

and was in the zenith of his reputation. Those who may be curious to see how very little a great philosopher can sometimes appear when he gives way to temper, will find the dispute between Pascal and Des Cartes very fully recounted in Bayle's Dictionary, *voce* "Pascal." The general opinion, however, of those who have considered this controversy is entirely with Pascal.

A second cause of disagreement between these two great men arose out of an occurrence of more importance than the treatise on conic sections. Torricelli had published to the world certain views as to the pressure of the atmosphere, which, among other results, displaced the received maxim, that nature abhors a vacuum. Pascal came to the conclusion that if the height to which the mercury will rise in a tube, or water in a pump, be due to the amount of atmospheric pressure, that pressure must be greater or less in proportion to the level at which the subject of the experiment is placed. He determined to verify this by actual experiment, and accordingly, having made the necessary preparations, a party of his friends ascended the mountain near Claremont, called the Puy de Dome, with the necessary instruments. The result was entirely to corroborate his anticipations. Pascal made known the adventure, and its scientific results, but after an interval of two years Des Cartes again interposed, and maintained that it was he who suggested to Pascal both the principle and the experiment. Pascal denied that he had ever had communication with Des Cartes on the subject, and there does not appear to be anything to corroborate Des Cartes' claim.

As regards Montaigne, the antipathy seems to have been very early excited. Pascal was deeply impressed with religious views, while Montaigne's general tendencies on such subjects were as far as possible the reverse. Thus we find that throughout the whole course of the

Thoughts, Pascal recurs always with acerbity, and sometimes with passion, to the opinions maintained by that distinguished writer.

Had Pascal's health not interrupted his mathematical studies, he would certainly have made some great contributions to natural science, for he had not only an ardent, but a constructive mind. In an article in the *North British Review* for 1884, Sir David Brewster says, that Pascal's treatise on the whole mass of air forms the basis of the modern science of pneumatics. This treatise was written in 1653, although not published until after Pascal's death. Sir David Brewster says of it, that the most remarkable part of this treatise, "and one which of itself would have immortalised him, is his application of the general principle to the construction of what he calls the mechanical machine for multiplying forces, an effect which he says may be produced to any extent we choose, as one man by means of this machine may raise a weight of any magnitude." The reviewer says this is the origin of Bramah's Hydrostatic Press. We find a curious indication of Pascal's ingenuity in this direction, in a work published by a traveller to Port Royal in 1814, who says, "We went to see the celebrated well dug in the midst of the farmyard under Pascal's directions. The well is 27 French toises in depth, and draws up the water from the level of the valley of Port Royal below. The curiosity consisted of the machinery contrived by Pascal, and executed under his direction, by which a child of ten years could with the greatest facility immediately draw up a quantity of water equal to nine common buckets."

Pascal also invented a calculating machine, the most perfect of its kind until Mr. Babbage's. He also set on foot a project for making and working a public carriage on the principle of the omnibus. His last contribution to science was a paper on the Cycloid, in 1661.

But these things while they show the strength and versatility of his genius, are not the foundations of his fame. The main importance which they possess for our present object is, that beyond exhibiting the rare mental endowments of the man, they also present an example of the combination of the profound knowledge of nature and her laws, with unqualified belief in and acceptance of religious truth.

Up to his twenty-third year, that is in 1646, Pascal had not exhibited any strong interest in religion, or in the controversies which were then in progress on religious questions. He had been brought up, as his two sisters had been, with reverential views of revealed religion, and his life had been decorous and regular. But in 1646, his father Etienne Pascal, met with an accident by slipping on the ice, and during the illness which ensued, and which lasted apparently for some time, Pascal was thrown into the society of two brothers who resided in the neighbourhood, and who had strong religious impressions. They were followers and under the influence of an ecclesiastic of the name of Gilbert, who seems to have been an eloquent preacher, and a friend and admirer of St. Cyran. Intercourse with these two brothers, and probably with the popular preacher, produced a strong impression on the mind of Pascal, and a severe and rather obstinate attack of a paralytic nature obliged him soon after to relinquish study of all kinds for a considerable time. This must have occurred about 1647, as he was prevented from taking a personal share in the ascent of the mountain to which we have referred, which took place in December, 1648. He left Rouen, where he had hitherto lived, for Paris in 1648, and shortly afterwards, the father, the younger daughter Jacqueline, and Pascal himself, removed to Auvergne, where he remained till 1650. From a remark which Pascal makes in the *Pensées*, it may be gathered that he turned his attention with his usual energy

and enthusiasm about this time to the study of the Scriptures and Patristic theology. He was not, and never was considered, or professed to be, a profound theologian; but he was well versed in the Fathers, and had begun to take a strong interest in the prevalent religious questions of the day. He says himself in the *Thoughts*, that he gave up his scientific pursuits, because he found that nobody cared to speak of them, and resolved rather to study the nature of man; but that he discovered to his disappointment that if his companions cared little for mathematics, still less did they care for the nature of man.

But a new element was about to enter into his life, that requires a word or two of explanation.

The period of European history with which we deal, the first half of the seventeenth century, was one in which religious dogma and politics were to a large extent intermingled. The Reformation had a considerable hold on the people in France. Within the Roman Catholic Church there were many men of power and learning, who, while they held aloof from the Reformers, and rather ostentatiously disowned them, endeavoured to stem the coming tide by a renovation of doctrine and morals within the Church of Rome. But the hand of power, civil and ecclesiastical, was too strong for them. The people were not Jesuit, and knew little of this comparatively recent ex-crescence on the Church, which, indeed, was more of a political than of an ecclesiastical federation. While the people to a large extent did not sympathize with the Jesuits, the Pope and the Crown supported them. Richelieu, and after him Mazarin, lent their power entirely to the ends and aims of the Jesuits, and, in one shape or other, made those who came under their displeasure feel the effects of it.

One of the most distinguished ecclesiastics within the Roman Catholic Church who supported the movement

towards the purer and simpler faith, and a renovation of morals within the Church itself, was the well-known Cornelius Jansen, a man of profound learning and of great ability. He had long been an object of animosity to the Jesuits, but his views were largely adopted throughout France. He was desirous that the Church should revert to the teaching of St. Augustine, especially as regarded the doctrine of the freedom and power of Divine grace. Those views were expounded by him in a book entitled "*Augustinus*," to the composition of which he had devoted a large portion of his life. He completed it, but was cut off by the plague in 1638, before it was published. He was followed by a band of devoted adherents belonging to the famous seminary of Port Royal, the retreat of a religious community situated ten or twelve miles from Paris, and having a corresponding establishment in Paris itself. A certain sentiment of romance hangs round this once celebrated spot, and still clings to its name, although its buildings have been long in ruins and its site very nearly forgotten. Its history went back many centuries, but its celebrity had but a short endurance, and began and terminated with the career of a knot of great men and women, whose simple faith and consistent life spread its reputation over Europe during the first half of the seventeenth century. Obscure before, it became only too powerful afterwards to suit the dominant faction in the Church, or the rulers who were ruled by it, from the eminence of those whom it nurtured. The steps by which this once renowned institution rose to fame, and was extinguished, as far as tyranny could extinguish it, are matters well known in history. They are recounted in the late work of St. Beuve, to which we have already referred. It is a touching and almost a tragic retrospect. Whatever one may think of the views and penances, the dogmatic opinions, ascetic practices, or religious ob-

servances of its inmates, their history breathes a fresh, whole-hearted consistency while it was flourishing, and a constancy when persecuted, which only thorough conviction could produce.

Among the greatest of the fraternity was John d'Hauranne, better known as the Abbé de St. Cyran. He was for years the stay of the institution. Highborn, and of imposing presence, and as simple as cultivated in manner, of unblemished character and life, he was largely instrumental in raising Port Royal to distinction. But he was the friend and coadjutor of Jansen, and on him descended the detestable tyranny of the times. Without trial, and even without accusation, he was seized and imprisoned, and remained in captivity for five years. He was released on the death of Louis XIII. in 1643, but too late to prolong his life, for he died within the year. He had been a friend of the elder Pascal, and the author of several works, which obtained considerable notice.

MONCRIEFF.

(To be concluded.)

MESSIANIC PSALMS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

LUKE i. 42-45, 46-55, 68-79; ii. 29-32.

(Continued from p. 309.)

WHILE the cosmology of Hesiod cannot be read in harmony with the science of the nineteenth century, that of Genesis cannot be read out of harmony with it; while the oracles of Delphi do not grow in wealth of content with advancing years, those of the Old Testament become more full of revelation and more precious in meaning with every age. But it is a fact which is in harmony with no theory of the nature of prophecy except that one which sees in it a message from God to man, intended, not to write history beforehand, but to give him a support and help in leading a holy life, of equal validity for all earthly time—nay, of increasing value as time rolls on. But if the older prophecies themselves thus become richer in meaning as time advances, and their presuppositions of fact and manner, beyond what was openly declared, become clear through additional revelations on advancing fulfilment; the repetition of the words of the older predictions need not be confined to their earliest and narrowest understanding. The mere fact, then, that all that the Psalms of Luke's first chapter say may be paralleled out of the Old Testament, does not quite exclude an advance in them beyond the revelations of the Old Testament—especially if we are thinking not of what might have been understood from them, but of what was understood from them.

It is important for us to observe this distinction—the distinction between unfolding revelation and growth in

understanding what is revealed. This is all the more necessary that we are dealing with compositions of a kind that take their place in both lines of development—that are both revelations from God and the response to God of pious and instructed hearts. It is not only conceivable, but certain, that Mary and Elizabeth, and Zacharias and Symeon, understood far less than their words express—we do not say less than they can be made to express merely, but less than they actually do express and cannot be made not to express. To ask what the words mean and what they meant to them are two very different questions, and we are to expect for them two different answers. Historically, the answer to the latter question preceded that to the former. Exegetically, the former must precede the latter. This would not be the case if we were seeking the original and typical senses of the words. But it is the case when what we are seeking is the intended and the understood senses. The intended sense is obtained by historico-grammatical exegesis; the understood sense by a further historical enquiry as to how much of this was comprehended by the agents of its delivery to men. This, no doubt, treats the original speakers in some measure as if they were hearers of their own words. But there is no help for it: the phenomena of revelation are peculiar, and demand for their explanation a theory—well, of revelation. The prophets diligently enquired into and sought what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ that was in them pointed unto (1 Pet. i. 10, 11), and delivered messages that even the angels did not at the moment understand; which unfolding years alone could make plain; but which in time, through additional revelation or progressive fulfilment, or both, were to become plain to even the humblest student of the Word.

It must be confessed that when we address ourselves to determining the former of these questions, we do not dis-

cover a great advance in our Psalms, on the revelations made in the Old Testament. That the advent of the Messiah brings blessing to Israel, and begins the fulfilment of God's precious promises; that it introduces a crisis into the world by which its present course is overturned—the imaginations of the proud brought to nought, the powerful cast down and the lowly elevated, the hungry filled with good things and the rich sent empty away; that it is the crowning proof of God's mercy, and brings not only relief from all enemies who make the service of God hard, but deliverance from the burden of sin through a strong redemption; that it introduces the eternal reign of peace; that its blessings will extend even to the Gentile world, and the purchase of them will demand suffering on the part of the Messiah Himself; all this is Old Testament teaching. A close scrutiny is required to discover any advance on the Old Testament at all, and when it is found it is seen to consist not in the enunciation of new particulars, but in the relative prominence given to the old. For instance, the Old Testament leaves the essential divinity of the Messiah little insisted on—especially in the Psalms. Many Psalms are theocratic rather than Messianic, and represent Jehovah Himself as coming for the Redemption of His people. Jehovah's coming and Messiah's coming are thus equally asserted. But the two are not plainly identified. The two lines run parallel. In these New Testament Psalms the identification seems to be made. When we remember that the angel had declared to Zacharias that his son should go before the face of the Lord,¹ and to Mary that her son should be called the "Son of the Most High" (ver. 32), "Holy" (ver. 35), "Son of God" (ver. 35), the humble cry of Elizabeth, "Whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me?" (ver. 43) quickened as

¹ The αὐτοῦ of verse 17 must beyond all question, refer back to Κύριον.

it was by the forerunner's leaping joy, takes on most solemn meaning—a meaning which is renewedly certified by the immediate reiteration of the same word “Lord” in an unmistakably Divine sense (ver. 45). In the light again of the preceding revelations by the angels and the song of Elizabeth, as just interpreted, Zacharias' words, “Thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Most High; for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare His ways” (ver. 76), seem to give witness to the Divinity of the Coming One. The spiritual nature of the Messianic work is another point which Zacharias' song places beyond question. By the coming of the Messiah, no doubt, “a horn of salvation is raised up in the house of David; . . . salvation from their enemies and from the hand of all that hate them” (ver. 68–71); but even this outward salvation is declared to be in order that “being delivered out of the hand of their enemies, they should serve Him without fear, in holiness and righteousness all their days” (ver. 74); and the great Messianic work that is on Zacharias' heart is carefully explained in verse 76, to be “giving the knowledge of salvation to His people as consisting in the forgiveness of their sins, on account of God's bowels of mercy.” This it is that is the special work of the forerunner to accomplish; and without this the Messiah's way would not be prepared. It almost seems as if the false development of Messianic hopes among the Jews was here recognised, and the purpose of God in sending a forerunner explained to be in order to correct them. There is some reason to believe that Zacharias' song hints further at the typical character of the Old Testament sacrifices, and their fulfilment in the Coming One: he speaks of His advent as working a ransom (ver. 68) for His people, and throughout has his mind on the symbolism of the altar. If this were found likely, it would imply a shadowy hint of the sufferings of the Messiah—a great revelation, not proceeding beyond

the prophecies of the Old Testament, indeed, but very far beyond any expectations of the time. Whether Zacharias obscurely presupposes them or not, Symeon openly declares them (ii. 34, 35): the child that lay in his arms "was set for a sign spoken against," and "a sword should pierce through Mary's soul" on account of Him. And here it is worth our while to observe the gulf that separates these songs from the contemporary, or then recent Pseudepigraphic literature of the Jews. They, as well as these, no doubt expected a superhuman Messiah, but so far from seeing in him a spiritual leader, they looked in him for nothing but a worldly conqueror, and after Symeon, no man who was not taught directly by Christianity, dreamed of a suffering Messiah for a hundred years. Justin Martyr makes his Jewish opponent Trypho—who has been with great probability identified with the famous Rabbi Tarphon—say: "For we knew that he must suffer, and be led as a sheep."¹ And the *Siphre* represents Rabbi Jose the Galilean as quoting Isaiah liii. 5, 6, to prove that the Messiah should be humbled and suffer.² These two contemporary and closely connected Rabbis, somewhere in the second quarter of the second century, represent the earliest dawning Jewish consciousness of the suffering Messiah. If, then, our New Testament canticles cannot be Christian forgeries, neither can they be deemed the natural outgrowth of the unilluminated Jewish consciousness of their time. And when we declare that they move entirely in the circle of thought of Old Testament times, we separate them from contemporary Judaism almost as sharply as from subsequent Christianity.

Let us keep in mind, however, that this is not the same as saying that the singers of those songs were out of sympathy with the hopes of their day. If the Old Testament predictions were misunderstood, why not also these songs?

¹ *Dial. c. Tryph.*, c. 90. ² Wüncke, *Die Leiden des Messias*, p. 65 sq.

It may seem that almost no room is left to doubt that Mary and Elizabeth knew the Divine nature of the child that the former was to bear, when we read the angelic messages and Elizabeth's humble cry, Yet how colourless Mary's own song becomes on such a supposition! And the subsequent narrative leaves no room at all to doubt that they did not at all comprehend what was said either to or by them. That wonderful day at Cæsarea Philippi appears first to have begotten an understanding in men of such ineffable words. In spite of the hints of Zacharias, the spirituality of the kingdom which Christ set up was never understood until He had died and risen again. And the path of suffering which He trod, although Symeon had openly declared it, was an offence to every heart, until He who had suffered, returned again to open their eyes with the cry: "Oh fools and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! Ought not the Christ to have suffered these things?" If, then, when we try to trace the progressive history of revelation itself, we find these Psalms moving entirely in the circle of Old Testament thought; when our object is to trace the growing perception of God's plan of salvation in the minds of His saints, we find even those that were waiting for the consolation of Israel, at the very moment of His coming lagging in their hopes still far behind what had been of old time revealed to the Fathers. The Psalms that they sing under the inspiration of God are Old Testament Psalms—even the essence and sublimation of Old Testament Psalmody. The faith they hold as their personal possession lifted itself in confidence and intensity, but probably not much in nature or contents above that of their time. They needed to wait for the understanding of even what God had spoken through them, for the time when He whom they expected so longingly should return from a sojourn in the grave, before their minds could be opened that they might under-

stand the Scriptures, and know that it was written that the Christ should suffer and rise again the third day, and only so enter into His glory (Luke xxiv. 45, 46). As yet it was "at the first," when they could not understand these things; but "when Jesus was glorified," "then remembered they that these things were written of Him, and that they had done these things unto Him" (John xii. 16).

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

BLAISE PASCAL.

(Continued from p. 320.)

WE pass over the interesting episode of his sister Jacqueline, and the gradual steps by which, after being caressed and distinguished in the best circles of society, she ultimately retired to the seclusion of Port Royal, and spent the rest of her life in its most austere observances. Not that this episode has not features of great interest—among others, the aspect in which it places one section at least of Parisian society. The circle of Port Royal came to be composed of many men in France of birth, position, and learning. Racine studied there, and Corneille was an old companion of Pascal. It was considered at the time that, in point of learning, the Port Royalists eclipsed the Jesuits. Yet these men, strong in their faith, were not found wanting when the time of trial came; and not only were they willing to renounce all the attractions of a world which had open arms to receive them, but they were ready to meet and resist the tide of persecution. That their convictions were sincere, although we may think them in part at least erroneous, cannot be doubted, and sincere conviction is not so common that we can afford to treat it otherwise than with respect.

But there was one man of the Port Royal brotherhood

whose name brings us back to our proper theme. Arnauld was the last of twenty children of the Parliamentary leader and orator of that name. He had steadily supported the views of Jansen, and in 1643 published a work on "Frequent Communion," which was decidedly adverse to the Jesuits. He was also the author of two separate treatises in defence of Jansen. Jansen's great work *Augustinus* filled the Jesuit party with acrimony, and after a variety of efforts to that end, they succeeded in obtaining a Papal Bull, condemning the book, in 1643. The condemnation proceeded on five propositions said to be heretical, and said to be contained in Jansen's book. It would be out of place here to enter on any sort of discussion on the special points on which the Jesuits demanded, and the Pope granted, the Bull of condemnation. It would be impossible to engage on any such field, without a much larger inroad on our readers' notice. Our only object in this recapitulation has been to explain the position of matters when Pascal next appears upon the scene, and that object will probably be accomplished by quoting the five propositions said to be heretical, which the Jesuits and the Pope said they had discovered in Jansen's book:—

"1. There are Divine precepts, which good men, though willing, are unable to obey.

"2. No person, in this corrupt state of nature, can resist the influence of Divine grace.

"3. In order to render human actions meritorious, or otherwise, it is not requisite that they be exempt from necessity, but only free from constraint.

"4. The semi-Pelagian heresy consisted in allowing the human will to be endued with a power of resisting grace, or of complying with its influence.

"5. Whoever says that Christ died or shed His blood, for all mankind, is a semi-Pelagian."

Such were the propositions; and it is easy to see by their

nature that they touch some of the most abstruse questions of dogmatic theology. Having succeeded in obtaining the Papal condemnation, the Jesuits made rancorous use of it against all suspected Jansenists by very violent and very insidious proceedings.

Pascal was recalled from Auvergne to Paris by Jacqueline's determination to enter Port Royal, which, after much dissuasion from her father and mother, they ultimately consented to her doing. We stumbled the other day, in a volume of the *Scots' Magazine* (vol. xvii.), upon an article comparing Pascal and Lord Kames, in which the writer, manifestly prejudiced against evangelical Christianity, denounces Pascal as a fanatic, because he compelled his sister in the flower of her youth to join the recluses of Port Royal. It was a singular comparison in any view, but unfortunately for the critic, there is no foundation whatever for the only point of contrast on which he dwells. He was so little instructed on the real position which Pascal occupied, that he says nothing of the *Provincial Letters*, and nothing of the *Thoughts*. He represents Pascal as pressing upon his sister a step which he took every means to prevent. At that time Pascal was so far from being given up to religious enthusiasm, that this event occurred at the period when he lived most in the world, and seemed for a time to have lost hold of the impressions of his early manhood. He continued his life of pleasure for four or five succeeding years. His ready wit, joined with his solid acquirements, made him a charming companion. He had a prodigious memory, mainly for facts or for ascertained truth, and a singular and almost unique instinct of divining results from very slender postules. According to St. Beuve, the most detailed of his biographers, while his mathematical reading was profound, his literary studies had been unmethodical and desultory. But still there were few branches of know-

ledge of which he was not master. Apparently from the time he regained his health in 1649, he lived the life of a man of society in Paris, in company with other young men of his own age, his principal companion being the young Duc de Roannez, who was his familiar friend. His father died in 1651, and left his son sufficiently provided for to enable him to continue, as he did, his life of ease and pleasure in society. The friendship of the Duc de Roannez did not end with Pascal's career in the gay world. St. Beuve says that M. de Sacy, who became Pascal's director at Port Royal, introduces Pascal, on his first arrival at Port Royal, in a light wholly unexpected. He says of him, that he was greatly in repute in the fashionable world, full of amusing pleasantries, of great conversational powers, a man who had read all sorts of books, and who willingly discoursed of them. He represented him as "*presque à la mode encore, et un vrai bel esprit, en regard de M. de Sacy, qui en tire mille étincelles.*"

The detractors of Pascal are fond of suggesting that during this period he led a dissolute life, but we have found nothing in our researches which lends colour to the imputation. Bayle, the author of the Dictionary, who is ever ready to recount scandal, gives the imputation a flat denial. That he led a thoughtless, unprofitable life of self-pleasing, dissipating his serious thoughts and earlier religious impressions in a round of frivolity with the chance companions of the hour, is quite true; and is, we think, quite sufficient to account for the expressions used by him afterwards.

Too much ingenuity has, we think, been displayed in the search for a motive for the next, and the most important, step of his life. About 1654 Pascal, who had contracted some intimacy with the inmates of Port Royal, had latterly held aloof from them, when all of a sudden he resolved to withdraw himself from the world, and to seek, in the retirement of Port Royal, the peace of mind which he seems

to have lost. Nothing could be more natural than for a man of Pascal's intellectual and moral intensity, finding himself drifting further and further from the standard which in happier days he had endeavoured to attain, under influences which he felt himself powerless to resist, resolving to end the conflict by quitting the scene of his temptations. Indeed this fact illustrates one peculiarity of Pascal's temperament. He was one of those who find themselves feeble to resist the attractions of the world without some countervailing excitement. We do not doubt that such was the real spring which led to Pascal's ultimate resolve to spend the rest of his days in Port Royal. He knew his own infirmities, and he found in the austerities of that retreat, and, as we have already remarked, even in his tortures, that amount of counter irritation which enabled him to pursue the tenour of his religious contemplation.

The theory that this sudden revolution was due to an accident which happened to him while driving in a carriage and four, when the fear of death was strong on him, wants confirmation; and we have great doubts of its accuracy. The incident is no doubt true, but Pascal never referred to it in that sense. It rather seems to have been suggested as the cause of his sudden change of life, by those who were sceptical of the power or the reality of religious conviction, and were in search for some singular or remarkable event to lead to so complete a retirement from the world. But Pascal was a man whose mind had already been impressed deeply by religious conviction, and who seems to have felt his faith being daily more and more entangled in the meshes of the gay world. Contempt for the unreality and unworthiness of the part he was playing would grow day by day; and it needed not a great but a slight cause to account for his resolution. To Port Royal accordingly he went. He placed himself under the direction of M. de Saci, a man of ability, and

after some months of occasional residence in Paris, he spent the remainder of his life in the exercise of the not inconsiderable austerities of the order. In the *Pensées* we find ample corroboration of this estimate of the impulses which led Pascal to this resolution; to which we may add the fact that two of his companions, the Duc de Roannez and M. Domat, the celebrated jurist, joined him at Port Royal. As these were not in the carriage accident, that event could not have been their inducement to join the fraternity at Port Royal; and this seems to indicate that some of the circle in which he lived had been impressed with serious views before he abruptly left them.

It was certainly a singular concurrence of events which led Pascal to Port Royal at this particular juncture. The Pope had all along allowed a rather undignified struggle to go on between the extreme Jesuits and the more moderate parties. He had condemned the five propositions already referred to; but to what extent this condemnation would be acted on in France, remained for some time doubtful. The Jesuits were not inclined to press the matter; but a certain Father Aunat brought the subject of Arnauld's letters before the Sorbonne, and it was feared that Arnauld might be visited by personal consequences. A meeting of Arnauld's friends was held, at which Pascal was present, to concert measures in defence. Arnauld stated his own views, which he had proposed to publish. The meeting, however, thought that Arnauld's learned and dry logic would produce no effect, and Arnauld at last turned to Pascal and asked him whether he, as a younger man, would not try his hand at a reply? Pascal said that he thought it was vain to argue with the Sorbonne, and that they could not be convinced, and that they should appeal to the public and write for them. Next day he brought to his friend the manuscript of the first *Provincial Letter*. Arnauld at once perceived that this was exactly

what was desired. It was printed anonymously, and published on the 29th January, 1656. Other letters to the number of eighteen in all followed at short intervals in the course of the next fourteen months.

The effect was prodigious. First Paris, then France, then Europe, rung with applause, and looked forward to the next *Provincial* as the amusement and topic of the day. No reply came or at least was attended to, for in the midst of the universal merriment no reply was possible. The Jesuits, instead of remaining the haughty masters of the position, suddenly found themselves exhibited to be laughed at by a very wide public circle, month after month. The chorus of applause went on to the end. The *Petits Lettres*, as they were called, became a French classic. There was announced in a book catalogue of last year a copy of the *Provincial Letters* in four different languages—French, Italian, Latin, and Spanish—under the date 1684. The Jesuits themselves, angry as they were, could not resist the spell, and were as anxious as the rest to get copies as they came out. The clergy, generally, seemed quite excited upon the subject. On the 31st January, 1656, on the day on which Arnauld's book was censured by the Sorbonne, M. St. Amour, writing to M. Arnauld, says of the first letter: "The letter of a *Provincial* has done wonders. It was read in the hall after dinner. It irritated M. Morel, M. Duchesne was greatly diverted, and the old Penitentiary went into fits of laughter over it."

It is very difficult to analyse the peculiar charm of the *Provincial Letters*. They profess to be letters written to a friend in the country in regard to this turmoil as to Jansen and his book "Augustinus." The man in the provinces wants to know what it is all about, and his friend in town sends him reports of imaginary conversations he has had with sundry Jesuits and Jansenists, to satisfy his curiosity. The main element of humour, the strain of which is kept

up throughout, consists of the absurd shifts to which the imaginary Jesuit is put to maintain his propositions, and the quiet grotesqueness with which he is made to stumble into the pitfalls prepared for him. No translation can in this respect do any justice to the original. For the French language admits of suppressed suggestion so much more effectively than ours, that what is decorous in one may sometimes seem coarse or even profane in the other. It is remarkable that the *Provincial Letters* were almost the first prose composition of that nature in the French language. The style has a close resemblance in brightness and humour to Molière's dialogue in his comedies, and Pascal, who was his contemporary, probably acquired it in the same circles. Voltaire said of it that the *Provincials* had fixed the language, and afforded a standard for the future. And, indeed, such has been the verdict of the world ever since.

But although the style of humour attracted readers, the quality which really gave force and weight to them was the adroit and masterly manner in which the underlying argument is implied and suggested. The result was, that casuistry in its old form, at all events for a considerable period, seemed to be utterly exorcised; and although between denial that such dogmas were ever held by the Jesuits, and the re-assertion of them in different phraseology and in a different garb, there may have been an attempt to breathe fresh life into it, since that thunderbolt was launched from Pascal's hand it has never recovered its old ascendancy.

Thus Pascal, retreating in search of obscurity to the shades of Port Royal, acquired by this almost fortuitous exercise of his powers a reputation, posthumous, it is true, of which he could not have dreamed. The first three letters were simply anonymous. The rest were published under the pseudonym of Louis de Montalte. A very active search

was at first made for the true author, for to laugh at the Jesuits was no trifle in those days. But Pascal's authorship was never discovered or avowed during his life. M. Nicole, a well-known scholar of the time, and one who had aided Pascal in preparing the letters, revised an edition of the work, in the preface to which he says, that the great applause and universal approbation with which these letters were received in France, arose mainly from the fact that the Jesuits and their doctrines were comparatively little known amongst the people. No attempt at a reply, at least none the name of which is remembered, was made for forty years, but in 1697, a Father Daniel published a reply, in which he accused the author of the *Provincials* with having misquoted and falsified the authorities on which he founded. But the allegation, although in some unimportant details it may seem to have a colour of foundation, has never been substantiated, and in any view came a great deal too late. If there had been any solid foundation for it, it would have been adduced when the popularity of the letters was fresh.

Of this celebrated work, it is impossible to give an epitome which shall convey any true impression of the vigour of the original.

It must be remembered however, first, that this was not a quarrel between Catholic and Protestant, but was wholly within the Roman Catholic Church. Our own sympathies, it is true, are with the Jansenist or Augustinian section, because they come nearer the Calvinistic standard. On the subject matter of the *Provincial Letters* and the five propositions, we should probably not agree with either side. Secondly, although those propositions and the disputes which arose out of them, relate to some of the most sacred and solemn theological themes, in reading the *Provincials*, we become so identified with the disputants—Father Bauny and his antagonist are so realistically described—that we fail to have any feeling of levity evoked by the rejoinders

in the course of the dialogue. Pascal was himself accused of irreverence in his way of dealing with topics so grave. He answered in the words of Horace, *Ridentem dicere verum, quid vetat?* He said, "I wished my book to be read, and so I tried to make it readable. I wished it to be read, not by doctors of the Sorbonne, but by the public, by women, and by the whole church, and I succeeded."

In fact, the controversy as to the five propositions condemned by the Pope, had a humorous complexion to start with. They were not the propositions of Jansen; they were the propositions which Father Cornet, a Jesuit, said he had found in Jansen's book. We believe Pascal was quite right when he said, that no one else could find them there; but the Pope had said they were there, and that not only was it heretical to hold these opinions, but that it was heresy to say they were not in Jansen's book; and the Pope, said the Jesuits, is infallible. True, replied the Jansenist, he is so as to doctrine, but as to matters of fact he may be misled, and if these propositions are not in Jansen's book, and no one has ever found them there, no Pope could alter the fact. Thus it is related that when Pascal undertook the task, he said he would endeavour to show it was only a dispute about words. It is, however, quite a different matter to judge of these smart sayings by sample, and to detach them from the dialogue they are intended to illustrate; so that for a full appreciation of the performance, the original must be referred to.

Dr. McCrie, whose translation of the *Provincials* is a very scholarly and admirable work, thus summarises in his Introduction the general scope and scheme of the letters. "The first three letters refer to Arnauld's affair; the questions of grace are but slightly touched, the main object being to interest the reader in favour of the Jansenists, and excite his contempt and indignation against his opponents. After this prelude, the fourth letter serves as a transition to the follow-

ing six, in which he takes up the maxims of the Casuists. In the eight concluding letters he resumes the grand objects of the work—the morals of the Jesuits, and the question of grace. The three parts have each their peculiar style. The first is distinguished for lively dialogue and repartee—Jacobins, Molinists, and Jansenists are brought on the stage, and speak in character, while Pascal does little more than act as reporter. In the second part he comes into contact with a casuistical Doctor, and extracts from him, under pretext of desiring information, some of the weakest and the worst of his maxims. At the eleventh letter, Pascal throws off his disguise, and addressing himself directly to the whole order of the Jesuits, and to their Provincial by name, he pours out his whole soul in an impetuous and impassioned torrent of declamation. From beginning to end it is a well sustained battle, in which the weapons are only changed in order to strike the harder" (p. 53).

But the javelin launched by Pascal's hand hit its mark. His foes were overwhelmed. St. Beuve, in the work to which I have already referred, says: "If the Jesuits are ever again expelled from France, the decree will have been pronounced by Pascal."

Of Pascal's personal history there is not much more to record. He never left Port Royal. In the year after the publication of the *Provincial Letters*, in 1658, he had a recurrence of his former malady, from which he never again recovered. He remained in his retreat, surrendering all his worldly possessions, conforming faithfully to the austere regulations of the institution, and enduring very intense bodily sufferings with a patient, childlike, and even cheerful resignation. His view, often expressed, was that the love of God was the chief good and the only felicity worth striving after; and his life bore testimony to the entire sincerity of his conviction.

One or two episodes occurred in the Port Royal com-

munity in the interval between 1638, and 1662, when he died; but they are not of sufficient interest or moment to lead us to dwell on them in detail. One was a difference of opinion between Pascal and Arnauld as to whether the nuns of Port Royal should sign a certain modified renunciation of the Five Propositions—Pascal was strongly of opinion that they should not; but this would lead us into the history of Port Royal, for which we have no space. The other, of more importance, was the supposed cure of Pascal's niece by a miracle worked by a thorn said to have been taken from our Saviour's crown of thorns. That Pascal had faith in modern miracles we have already said; that a sudden improvement in the patient's condition was coincident with the application of the thorn seems to be true; but these things fall very far short of the conclusion reached by Pascal. He, however, did consider them as an indication of the Divine favour, and threw aside all other avocations to devote himself to religious exercises and meditation. He died on the 16th of August, 1662, falling asleep without pain or struggle, and as placidly as a child.

The other work on which Pascal's literary fame rests is of a very different character from the *Provincial Letters*. After his death there were found a large number of detached MSS.—some fragmentary, and some more carefully composed, and more complete—of the nature of Reflections on Religion and on Life. It is known that Pascal at one time meditated the composition of an Apology, or Defence, of the Christian Religion; and there is little doubt that these were meant to find their place in a systematic treatise. But the state of his health for the last four years of his life seems to have prevented the completion of the design; and accordingly we have only the disjointed fragments of a colossal fabric, fitted together as the views of each separate editor might suggest, without any certainty as to the true intent of the author. But in whatever order these noble

Thoughts are placed relatively to each other, we do not know a more impressive collection in the whole circle of European literature.

There has been, as might be expected, a good deal of controversy among critics as to the editing of these valuable remains. The first editions were certainly to some extent manipulated—some things interpolated, and some suppressed, without any warrant from the author or any indication of his intention. This arose not from any want of fidelity on the part of those to whom they were entrusted, but from the fear of compromising the living through the opinions of the departed. Even, however, without any presupposed method, these scattered pages are magnificent. The mingled gentleness and loftiness, the deep spiritual ardour in combination with the most intimate and acute knowledge of the world, the scorn and the tenderness, the precision and the eloquence which they display, disclose a mind and an intellect rarely surpassed. However therefore the materials may be arranged, the order of the author's design is not doubtful. Proposing to himself to compose a comprehensive work, showing forth, first, man's need of redemption; and secondly, the truth, adequacy, and sufficiency of the Gospel scheme, through all the different stages; he commences by showing in vivid colours the actual position of man on the earth. He describes, after some introductory pages, the disproportion of man—his diversion, his greatness, and his littleness; the deceptions of his imagination; his justice, customs, and prejudices; his weakness, unrest, and defects. From these he draws the conclusion that some element has marred the primæval object with which this being was created—so grand and yet so mean, so intent on happiness and yet so powerless to obtain it. And having with a wonderfully graphic power gathered together the various features of this striking though depressing picture, he turns to the reverse; and shows how,

through the Jewish dispensation, the types, the prophecies, the miracles, and lastly the coming of the Saviour, the balance was to be at last redressed. As the author never, in point of fact, presented to the world even the outline of such a scheme, it is difficult to criticise it as a completed work, or even as the commencement of one. Pascal had only collected the materials, and we cannot tell what he would have used or what discarded. But what a rich treasure they are, even as they lie, where they were thrown down at random; a collection of precious gems, well fitted to adorn the projected palace.

It would be in vain for us to attempt, within any reasonable compass, to give any appreciable outline of this rare and admirable work. We shall only subjoin a few of his reflections on ethics, which, although apparently desultory, all converge on the general plan we have described; and they may serve as an example of the earnest and vigorous spirit which pervades the rest.

In his General Introduction he thus opens the first part of his theme:—

“We need no great elevation of soul to understand that here is no true and solid satisfaction; that all our pleasures are but vanity, our evils infinite; and lastly, that death, which threatens us every moment, must infallibly and within a few years place us in the dread alternative of being for ever either annihilated or wretched.”

“Nothing is more real than this, nothing more terrible. Brave it out as we may, that is the end which awaits the fairest life in the world. Let us reflect on this, and then say if it be not certain that there is no good in this life save in the hope of another; that we are happy only in proportion as we approach it, and that as there is no more sorrow for those who have an entire assurance of eternity, so there is no happiness for those who have not a ray of light.”

“Assuredly then it is a great evil to be in doubt; but it is at least an indispensable duty to seek when we are in such doubt; he, therefore, who doubts and yet seeks not, is at once thoroughly unhappy, and thoroughly unfair. And if at the same time he be easy and content, profess to be so, and in fact pride himself thereon; if it even be this very condition of doubt which forms the subject of his joy and boasting, I have no terms in which to describe a creature so extravagant.”

This is the keynote which he proceeds to follow up in this first part. He goes on to say, “Nothing is so important to man as his condition—nothing so formidable to him as eternity—and thus it is not natural that there should be men indifferent to the loss of their being, and the peril of endless woe. They are quite other men in regard to all else; they fear the veriest trifles; they foresee them; they feel them; and the very man who spends so many days and nights in rage and despair for the loss of office, or for some imaginary insult to his honour, is the same who without disquiet and without emotion knows that he must lose all by death.”

He goes on to consider “Man’s Disproportion,” meaning man’s inadequacy to fill fully, or comprehend accurately, the position in which he finds himself. “For after all,” he says, “what is man in nature. A nothing in regard to the infinite; a whole in regard to nothing; a mean between nothing and the whole; infinitely removed from understanding either extreme. The end of things and their beginnings are invincibly hid from him in impenetrable secrecy; he is equally incapable of seeing the nothing from which he was taken, and the infinite in which he is engulfed.”¹

This leads the moralist to say a few very weighty

¹ These quotations are taken from a very able translation of the *Pensées*, lately published by Kegan Paul & Co., of London.

sentences in regard to the aspirations of science to ascertain the origin of the present order of the world.

He says that "of the two infinities, of greatness and of littleness, that the first is most obvious to the senses; but that it is impossible to know and prove it; the infinite multitude of things being so hidden that all we can express by word or thought is but an invisible trace of them. Hence it is plain how foolish, vain and ignorant is that title of some books, *de omni scientia*—of everything knowable."

"But the infinitely little is far less evident. Philosophers have much more frequently asserted that they have attained it; yet in that very point they have all stumbled. This has given occasion for such common titles as *The Origin of Creation*, *The Principles of Philosophy*, and the like, as presumptuous in fact, although not in appearance, as that dazzling one, *de omni scientia*."

These are the words of a man in the front rank, and before his age, in the profundity of his scientific attainments. He says, farther on,—

"If man were to begin with the study of himself, he would see how incapable he is of proceeding farther. How can a part know the whole? But he may perhaps aspire to know at least the parts with which he has proportionate relation. But the parts of the world are so linked and related that I think it impossible to know one without another or without the whole." And farther on he repeats, "I hold it impossible to know one alone without all the others; that is to say, impossible purely and absolutely."

In these few sentences we think we have a rule or canon which seems effectually to bar the way against scepticism founded on scientific discovery. The answer is, we may know this fact in some of its relations, but we cannot know it in all; and until we can, we are incapable of forming any conclusion as to its true or universal import. There is

something almost prophetic in these utterances of Pascal. But he continues, "It is impossible that our reasoning part should be other than spiritual; and should any allege that we are simply material, this would far more exclude us from the knowledge of things, since it is an inconceivable paradox to affirm that matter can know itself, and it is not possible for us to know how it should know itself."

"Let us conceive then that this mixture of spirit and clay throws us out of proportion. Hence it comes that almost all philosophers have confounded different ideas, and speak of material things in spiritual phrase. For they say boldly that bodies have a tendency to fall, that they seek after their centre, that they fear a void, that they have inclinations, sympathies, antipathies; and all of these are spiritual qualities."

We are not without daily examples of the same misnomers. Nor are they ever resorted to excepting for an object; to cover theories which, true or false, do not admit of demonstration. Pascal sums up this matter thus, as his experience in his investigations into science.

"The sciences have two extremes which meet. The first is that pure natural ignorance in which every man is born. The other extreme is that reached by great minds, who having run through all that men can know, find that they know nothing, and again come round to the same ignorance from which they started; but this is a learned ignorance, conscious of itself. Those between the two, who have left their natural ignorance, and not been able to reach the other, have some tincture of this vain knowledge, and assume to be wise. These trouble the world, and judge all things falsely."

Pascal did not disparage science—in fact, he continued his scientific pursuits to the end of his life. But he resented what he considered the trespass of science beyond its true bounds, and its intrusion into regions which are far beyond

and above it. Des Cartes' philosophy was what he had in his mind.

We might fill many pages, not unpleasantly or unprofitably, with further extracts from this valuable treasury.

On man's need for diversion or distraction, he says, that "Man has two instincts,—one to look for occupation from without, and the other to be at rest. Between these two rolls all our life away. We seek repose by resistance to obstacles, and so soon as these are surmounted, repose becomes intolerable. For we think either on the miseries we feel, or on those we fear. And even when we feel sheltered on all sides, weariness, of its own accord, will spring from the depths of the heart wherein are its natural roots, and fill the soul with its poison."

We pass by the very beautiful chapters on the greatness of man, on his imagination, on his weakness, unrest, and defects, and conclude our imperfect summary by this noble apostrophe to the philosophers.

"Know then, proud man, how great a paradox thou art to thyself. Bow down thyself, weak reason; be silent, thou foolish nature; learn that man is altogether incomprehensible by man, and learn from your Master your true condition which you ignore. — Hear God."

"For in a word had man never been corrupt, he would innocently and securely enjoy truth and happiness. And had man never been otherwise than corrupt, he would have no idea of virtue or blessedness. But wretched as we are, and even more than if there were no greatness in our condition, we have an idea of happiness and cannot attain it; we feel an image of truth, and possess a lie only, alike incapable of absolute ignorance and of certain knowledge, so manifest is it that we once were in a degree of perfection from which we have unhappily fallen."

Such are a few gleanings from this almost inexhaustible storehouse of wisdom. We can conceive no better pre-

servative against some of the prevalent tendencies of the day, than the study of these interesting aphorisms. They are so real, so genuine, and go so deep into the springs of human action. The spirit which breathes throughout is so thoroughly evangelical; and probably it was this very feature which delayed the publication for eight years, and then led to the careful editing, qualification and interpolation which the text underwent. For the one deadly accusation against the author of the *Provincial Letters* was that he was a Calvinist; and that substantially was a crime against the State.

We find accordingly in these *Thoughts* one reference to confession, some words on the Pope's authority, not unmixed with misgivings that it might become tyrannical, some very hearty denunciations of schisms and Calvinists, but the staple of his *Thoughts* is evangelical both in words and in spirit, breathing the true doctrine of the Reformation in its breadth and power.

Such, faintly sketched, was the noble character of Pascal. To us it seems hard that so great a spirit should have been enclosed in so frail an earthly tenement. We cannot help imagining that had he been blest with health and length of days, his almost miraculous endowments might have done priceless service to mankind and to true religion. But we must be thankful for the footsteps he has left behind him, and learn the lesson which they teach.

We conclude with these singular and touching words with which he ends one of the chapters of his *Thoughts*.

"I love poverty, because He loved it. I love wealth, because it gives the power of helping the miserable. I keep my troth to every one, rendering not evil to those who do me wrong; but I wish them a lot like mine, in which I receive neither good nor evil from men. I try to be just, true, sincere and faithful to all men; I have a tender heart for those to whom God has more closely bound me; and whether I

am alone, or seen of men, I place all my actions in the sight of God, who shall judge them, and to whom I have consecrated them all."

"Such are my opinions, and each day of my life I bless my Redeemer, who has transformed me, a man full of weakness, misery, and lust, of pride and ambition, into a man exempt from all these evils, by the power of His grace, to which all the glory is due; since of myself I have only misery and sin."

MONCREIFF.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

A CRITICAL ESTIMATE.

FOURTH PAPER.

CASES of "literalism" and "obscurity" in the English of the R.V. have been sufficiently dealt with. This Paper will tabulate instances where we think that an obsolete, or imperfect interpretation of the Hebrew has received the **Revisers'** suffrage. The writers may remark at the outset that they have re-examined (often independently of each other) well nigh every hard passage in the Hebrew Bible. They have arrived at the same decision in quite nineteen cases out of twenty. It is their misfortune to find, on turning to the R.V., about a third of what seemed unassailable translations, not exhibited in the text, but "*skied*" in a marginal annotation. In self-defence they again draw the reader's attention to the fact that a two-thirds majority was required before the Revisers could emend an A.V. mis-translation.

Gen. xxxvii. 3. Joseph's "*coat of many colours*" remains. We know no better reason for attaching this sense to

the Heb. כְּתֹנֶת פָּסִים than the fact that LXX. here gives χιτῶνα ποικίλον, and Vulg. "tunicam polymitam." The same phrase occurs in 2 Sam. xiii. 18, where these Versions give the preferable rendering, χιτῶν ἀστραγαλωτός, "talaris tunica," i.e. a robe reaching down to the ankles, the unusual length indicating special dignity. The composition of the term may thus be illustrated by our modern word, *paijāmah*, which literally means "feet-clothing." Or as פֶּסַח is used of the "palm" of the hand in Chaldee, it is possible (but not so likely) that a "tunica manciata," or "long-sleeved tunic" is meant. Of course the Chaldee word does mean also a "piece," or "patch," but we can hardly believe it was thought glorious in lands noted for graceful apparel to dress like a clown in a pantomime. A "long robe" adapted to a life of luxurious ease, suggests itself. Joseph's brethren in work-a-day garb were naturally jealous of his being dressed like an idle gentleman.

Gen. xlv. 24. "See that ye *fall not out* by the way." We see no reason why Joseph's brethren should "fall out" on the road homewards, but they had every reason to "*be afraid*"; and to think twice before venturing again into their injured brother's presence. The R.V. renders this verb in Ps. iv. 4, "stand in awe." Like our "be nervous," it may indicate agitation from emotions of divers kinds. Here surely the all-powerful viceroy foresees the suspicions and second thoughts, which his guilty brethren will entertain when they have left his palace; so he says, "*Do not be afraid during the journey.*"

Gen. xlix. 14. "A strong ass *couching down between the sheep-folds*" is not a familiar spectacle; and the reader will wonder why the Patriarch chose such an odd simile in forecasting the fate of Isaachar. Nothing in the root connects the Heb. מִשְׁפָּתִים with "sheep." What is meant is surely, "A strong ass *couching in the midst of the pen,*" the very type of sullen but unresenting indiffer-

entism. Let him who doubts keep a donkey in the stable, and compare its habitual pose with the erect attitude of a horse. But the "couching" here originally suggested a more striking contrast. Judah, says the Patriarch, is a lion couching in his dreaded lair; Issachar is the spiritless couching beast of the stall, destined "to bow down his shoulder to bear, and become a servant under task-work." Similarly in Judg. v. 16; Ps. lxxviii. 13, we would substitute "*pens*" or "*enclosures*" for "*sheep-folds*." It is by no means certain in the latter case that it is not a *lager*, or camp-enclosure. Well, anything is better than the A.V.'s "Though ye have lien among the *pots*," albeit this rendering is sometimes invested with a deep ethical significance in devotional books. Job xxix. 24.

"If I laughed on them they *believed it not*." The pious sheikh is describing the philanthropy of his past life, and the general respect he won among the tribesmen. But a man whose smile cannot be credited is scarcely an attractive character. Besides there is no "if." Rend. "*I would smile on them [when] they were perturbed*." The root אָנַן denotes primarily *standing firm*; and there is no need to press its ethical use with reference to *belief*.

Job xxxix. 24. Here too this last remark applies. R.V. gives "*Neither believeth he that it is the voice of the trumpet*." We think the war-horse would not entertain any belief on the subject. Rend. "*And he stands not still at the voice of the trumpet*."

Ps. xxv. 17. "*The troubles of my heart are enlarged*." Surely it is plain that צָרָה "*distress*," is in antithesis to the verb, which must be pointed הִרְחִיבוּ. We will not try to reproduce the figures of "straits" and "enlargement" familiar to all scholars. Rend. "*My heart is in distress, do Thou give it deliverance*."

Ps. xli. 3. "*Thou makest all his bed in his sickness*." Were Jewish beds "made"? Would הָפַךְ "to turn" be the verb to represent the pro-

cess? And why "all," seeing a bed can hardly be made in part? The noun doubtless means here not the "bed," but the "being bed-ridden." Rend. "Thou, when he is sick, wilt *turn all his prostration* [*scil. to health*]."

Ps. lxxii. 15. "*And they shall live*, and to him shall be given of the gold of Sheba." This emendation is quite unwarrantable. The Heb. is "*And may he live*," and the phrase יחי המלך "*vivat rex*" was doubtless in the writer's mind. We note that the whole Psalm is a prayer, not a prophecy. We must render, therefore, "*may it be given*"; and substitute the precativè "*may*" for "*shall*" throughout the piece. Ps. lxxiii. 25.

"*There is none upon earth that I desire beside thee*." Surely the Heb. does not mean this. Literally it is, "With Thee I delight not in the earth." This we render freely, "*In communion with Thee, I need no earthly pleasure*."

Ps. lxxviii. 51. "*The chief of their strength* in the land of Ham." Other passages make it certain that the Heb. means "firstlings of virile strength," as Delitzsch puts it. In fact, this second clause of the verse is a mere variation of the first, which runs "and smote all the firstborn in Egypt." But there is no need to reproduce the idiom. Rend. "*The first-begotten* in the land of Ham." So too in Ps. cv. 36, we must give "*all their first begotten sons*" for R.V.'s "*chief of all their strength*."

Ps. xc. 4. "A thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday, *when it is past*." Yesterday must be past. The R.V. makes the final clause a superfluity. Surely we should render "A thousand years *when past*, are but as yesterday." The singular of the verb merely denotes that the thousand years are regarded as a single period.

Ps. cxvi. 15. "*Precious* in the sight of the LORD is the death of his saints." We do not understand the Revisers' meaning, but we hold that יקר here has its primary signification, "weighty." We may

keep the idiom by rendering "*No light matter* in the sight of the LORD, etc." Ps. cxxiii. 5. The *proud*

waters had gone over our soul." Here too we must think of the primary meaning of the adjective, rather than its ethical significance. Rend. "*The swelling waters*," or "*The surging waters*." Prov. x. 9. "He

that walketh uprightly walketh surely: but he that perverteth his ways *shall be known*." Irish members, and the dire penalty of being "*named*," at once suggest themselves to us. A good verse ends in mere bathos. We believe Jer. xxxi. 19 gives sufficient proof that נודע may mean "*be corrected*." We might draw arguments from the use of other Voices of the verb. If this be not allowed we must paraphrase—"*gets infamy*," or "*gets notoriety*."

Prov. xi. 21. "[*Though*] *hand [join] in hand*, the evil man shall not be unpunished." The force of the expression "*hand in hand*," which recurs in xvi. 5, is not certainly known. But the interpretation which R.V. retains from A.V. is the least likely that has been suggested. We prefer the view that it means "*From generation to generation*." "*My hand upon it*," of the margin, is preferable to the rendering of the text.

Prov. xii. 27. "The slothful man *roasteth not that which he took in hunting*." Again the margin is more scholarly than the text. "The slothful man *will not ensnare his prey*," is better; the Commentaries will tell the student why.

Prov. xvii. 7: "*Excellent speech* becometh not a fool." Of course the reader will think "*excellence of speech*," or "*eloquence*," is meant. What the Revisers intend we know not, but probably they endorse Gesenius' "*verba egregia de virtute et sapientia*." We think this view of שפת יתר is right, but "*excellent speech*," does not express it. Besides, "*fool*" is not exact. The fact is, Hebrew has a superabundance of terms for "*fool*" which must have delighted the late Mr. Carlyle, and נבל represents

the mischievous rather than the thick-headed type of fool. Freely rendered, the verse = "*To talk of virtue becometh not a villain.*"

Prov. iv. 7. "*Wisdom is the principal thing; [therefore] get wisdom.*" It is better to render, "*As the first step in wisdom, get wisdom,*" though this translation may not be so attractive. We may compare our own English proverb, "Nothing succeeds like success."

Prov. iv. 23. "Keep thy heart with all diligence." This is hardly possible. Rend. "*more than all else that thou keepest,*" taking מִשְׁמֶרֶת in sense of מִשְׁמָרֶת, Exod. xii. 6, etc.

Prov. vi. 13. "He winketh with his eyes, he speaketh with his feet." We demur to this view of the verb מָלַל. Rend. "*shuffleth.*"

Prov. vi. 30. "Men do not despise a thief, if he steal to satisfy his soul, etc." Practically the verse means that we do not let such a thief off easy. Rend. "*deal lightly with*" for "*despise.*"

Prov. vi. 34. Apropos of the outraged husband—"For jealousy is the rage of a man." We hardly know what the R.V. means. But unless it be admissible to give "For jealousy is a mighty rage," we must render freely, "For jealousy begets rage in the man."

Prov. viii. 36. Wisdom says, "But he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul." The antithesis, "whoso findeth me findeth life," surely endorses the equally allowable "*misseth me,*" for "sinneth against me."

Prov. xxviii. 18. "Whoso walketh uprightly shall be delivered: but he that is perverse in [his] ways shall fall at once." The Heb. is literally "he that is entangled in two ways"; we have the same phrase in ver. 6. A "Pecksniff" or "Mr. Facing-both-ways" seems to be contrasted with a man of fixed principle. The word "uprightly" is misleading; for there is no metaphor connected with walking in the first clause. And we render not "*at once,*" but "*in one of them*"; the hypocrite's very inconsistency brings him to grief at last. We must render very freely to do justice to this verse.

We suggest "A man of consistent life shall go on safely; but he who tries double courses shall fall in one of them."

Eccles. xii. 13: "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the *whole* [duty] of man." The Hebrew is exactly reproduced in the LXX.'s ὅτι τοῦτο πᾶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος, "for this is the whole of man." We regard the introduction of the word "duty" as quite out of keeping with the tenor of the book. It is a philosophical rather than a moral disquisition. "The whole *metier* of man" would express our view, were the term allowable. "The whole *business*" is better than "the whole *duty*."

Isa. i. 27. "Zion shall be redeemed with judgment, and her *converts* with righteousness." Is it not better to interpret "they that return of her" (i.e. *her restored people*?) as margin? We have nothing to do with proselytes here.

Isa. ii. 22. "Cease ye from man *whose breath is in his nostrils*." This should rather be "*in whose nostrils is mere breath*."

Isa. v. 30. "The light is darkened in the *clouds* thereof." We believe ערפֿים is not "clouds," but is either "*destruction*," or "*ruins*." We cannot forbear quoting the bold rendering of a great scholar to whom Cambridge owes much, "An enemy comes with the light; and darkness sets in on her ruins"; i.e. dawn brings the foe, dusk finishes his work.

Isa. vii. 16. "The land whose two kings thou *abhorrest* shall be forsaken." To "abhor" in the modern sense is not the true meaning of קִנִּי. Rend. "The land whose two kings thou *dreadest*." Similarly in Exod. i. 12, rend. "And they *dreaded* the children of Israel," not "And they were *grieved because of* the children of Israel," as R.V.

Isa. xl. 2. "Cry unto her that her *warfare* is accomplished." We prefer "that her *time of service* is accomplished"; and similarly in Job vii. 1, where R.V. gives, "Is there not a *warfare* to man upon earth?" That צָבָא can bear this meaning is shown by Num. iv. 23; viii. 24.

Isa. xli. 26. "Who hath declared from the beginning that we may know, and beforetime that we may say that He is "*righteous*." Surely "*right*" rather than "*righteous*." צַדִּיק often refers specially to truthfulness; here it = "*il a raison*."

Isa. xlii. 19. "Who is blind as *he that is at peace with me*." Despite Gesenius, we do not believe מְשַׁלֵּם can mean "he that is at peace with me" (מְשַׁלֵּם?): nor yet "*he that is perfect*," as A.V: "*He that has been recompensed*," seems to be the meaning.

Isa. xlv. 15. "Verily thou art a God *that hidest thyself*, O God of Israel, the Saviour." Here as often, we regret that speeches are not indicated by inverted commas. Probably the Revisers take the speech, as we do, as proceeding from the African converts of ver. 14. In this case (indeed in any case), why should the God who has revealed Himself be called "God that hidest Thyself." Rend. "*A God that actest mysteriously*," His thoughts not being as men's thoughts, etc. cf. vv. 9, 10.

Isa. xlvii. 3. "I will take vengeance, and will *accept no man*." This we suppose is to be interpreted by the note, "Or *make truce with no man*." But we believe the passage simply means, "I will take vengeance and *shall encounter no resistance*," lit. "shall encounter no man." So Symmachus and Jerome.

Isa. lii. 15. We were distressed to find the old rendering, "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations." What commentator of any note retains this interpretation of יִזְחַק? We admit critics differ as to the root. But they are agreed that the words mean practically, "So shall he *startle* many nations." Those who were "astonied" at his grievous degradation shall be equally "startled" at his great exaltation. Cf. LXX. οὕτως θαυμάσονται ἔθνη πολλὰ ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

Isa. liii. 8. "For the transgression of my people *was he stricken*." We prefer "*who themselves deserved the stroke*." We confess also a sneaking fondness for the well-known translation, "It was exacted and he was

held responsible" in ver. 7. But the whole passage is notoriously difficult. The Revisers have dealt fairly well with it, albeit in piecemeal fashion. But what do they mean by their "*yet*" in ver. 12: "I will divide him a portion with the great . . . because he poured out his soul unto death . . . *yet* he bare the sin of many." Apparently they give a slightly adversative force to וְהוּא. God thus rewards him, because he *not only* suffered, *but* suffered for unamiable characters. But we doubt if the reader will see this. "*Bearing the while* the sin of many" would be better.

Isa. liv. 11. "I will set thy stones *in fair colours*." Is this rendering based on the mistaken connexion of פִּיךָ and φῦκος? פִּיךָ is certainly "antimony" or "stibium," used by Oriental females to darken the eyelid. We believe that in this description of architectural ornamentation the metaphor of the "bride" (ver. 5) is still latent. But anyhow, gray ore of antimony is not "*fair colours*."

Isa. lix. 18. "*According to their deeds*, accordingly he will repay." Surely it is certain גְּמֻלוֹת here means "requital," "retribution," cf. Jer. li. 56. Rend. "*On principles of retribution* will He render."

Amos vi. 10. "And a man's *uncle* shall take him up, even he that burneth him." דוֹר sometimes = "uncle," but it clearly means here either "*near relation*" or (as commonly) "*friend*." A man seldom expects his "uncle" to preside at his cremation or burial.

Nah. ii. 9. There is none end of the store, the *glory of all pleasant furniture*." We appreciate the archaisms "none" and "pleasant," but should prefer a lucid rendering. "*There is no end of the stores: there is a quantity of all precious vessels*," seems to express the sense.

Zech. x. 12: "And they shall *walk up and down* in his name, saith the LORD." What is meant is—their life shall be regulated by the fear of Jehovah. But why "*up and down*?" We might as well render in Gen. v. 22, "Enoch walked up and down with God."

In our next paper we shall notice stiff passages which the Revisers have not tried to cope with. We will here briefly notice another fault in the R.V.—neglect of an emphasis distinctly marked in the original. Thus in Isa. xxxvi. 10 the Assyrian vaunt is tamely rendered, “And am I now come up without the LORD against this land to destroy it.” The Heb. is, “And now is it without the LORD that I am come up, etc.”

Isa. xli. 27. “I first will say unto Zion, Behold, behold them.” How are we to emphasize this? By its position and by the context the stress is thrown on the Heb. word “first.” We must render either “I am the first to say to Zion, etc.,” or “I am beforehand in saying to Zion, etc.,” according as we interpret the passage.

Isa. liii. 4 is still tamely translated “Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows.” Yet the emphasis of the Heb. is plain, “Surely our griefs He bore, and it was our sorrows that He carried.” This brings out the antithesis of the sequel, “Yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted.”

Ps. lxxiii. 28. “But it is good for me to draw near unto God.” In the Heb. there is a marked contrast between the Psalmist’s happy choice and that of men who, he says, are “far” from God. “But I—drawing nigh to God is good for me.”

Ps. lxxv. 3. “The earth and all the inhabitants thereof are dissolved: I have set up the pillars of it.” Who notes the emphasis on the “I”? But the whole Psalm is miserably rendered, and no uninstructed reader will guess what it is about. This verse wears a very different aspect if rendered, “When the land and all its inhabitants were dissolved, it was I who poised up its foundations.”

Ps. lxxvi. 8. “Thou didst cause sentence to be heard from heaven; the earth feared, and was still,” Would the reader imagine that “heaven” and “earth” were here in strongest antithesis. We render “From Heaven Thou didst issue sentence; Earth feared

and was still." The baffled invader (probably Sennacherib) is regarded as the world-power arraying itself in impotent fury against Jehovah.

A. C. JENNINGS.

W. H. LOWE.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

XI.

CONCILIATORY AND HORTATORY TRANSITION TO POLEMICS.

"This I say, that no one may delude you with persuasiveness of speech. For though I am absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the spirit, joying and beholding your order, and the stedfastness of your faith in Christ.

"As therefore ye received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk in Him, rooted and builded up in Him, and stablished in your faith, even as ye were taught, abounding in thanksgiving.—COL. ii. 4-7 (Rev. Ver.).

NOTHING needs more delicacy of hand and gentleness of heart than the administration of warning or reproof, especially when directed against errors of religious opinion. It is sure to do harm unless the person reproofed is made to feel that it comes from true kindly interest in him, and does full justice to his honesty. Warning so easily passes into scolding, and sounds to the warned so like it even when the speaker does not mean it so, that there is special need to modulate the voice very carefully.

So in this context, the Apostle has said much about his deep interest in the Colossian Church, and has dwelt on the passionate earnestness of his solicitude for them, his conflict of intercession and sympathy, and the large sweep of his desires for their good. But he does not feel that he can venture to begin his warnings till he has said something more, so as to conciliate them still further, and to remove from their minds other thoughts unfavourable to the sympathetic reception of his words. One can fancy some

Colossians saying, "What need is there for all this anxiety? Why should Paul be in such a taking about us? He is exaggerating our danger, and doing scant justice to our Christian character." Nothing stops the ear to the voice of warning like a feeling that it is pitched in too solemn a key, and fails to recognise the good,

So before he goes further, he gathers up his motives in giving the following admonitions, and his estimate of the condition of the Colossians, in the two first of the verses now under consideration. All that he has been saying has been said not so much because he thinks that they have gone wrong, but because he knows that there are heretical teachers at work, who may lead them astray with plausible lessons. He is not combating errors which have already swept away the faith of the Colossian Christians, but putting them on their guard against such as threaten them. He is not trying to pump the water out of a water-logged vessel, but to stop a little leak which is in danger of gaping wider. And, in his solicitude, he has much confidence and is encouraged to speak because, absent from them as he is, he has a vivid assurance, which gladdens him, of the solidity and firmness of their faith.

So with this distinct definition of the precise danger which he feared, and this soothing assurance of his glad confidence in their steadfast order, the Apostle at last opens his batteries. The 6th and 7th verses are the first shot fired, the beginning of the monitions so long and carefully prepared for. They contain a general exhortation, which may be taken as the keynote for the polemical portion of the epistle, which occupies the rest of the chapter.

I. We have then first, the purpose of the Apostle's previous self-revelation. "This I say"—this namely which is contained in the preceding verses, the expression of his solicitude, and perhaps even more emphatically, the declaration of Christ as the revealed secret of God, the inexhaustible

storehouse of all wisdom and knowledge. The purpose of the Apostle, then, in his foregoing words has been to guard the Colossians against the danger to which they were exposed, of being deceived and led astray by "persuasiveness of speech." That expression is not necessarily used in a bad sense, but here it evidently has a tinge of censure, and implies some doubt both of the honesty of the speakers and of the truthfulness of their words. Here we have an important piece of evidence as to the then condition of the Colossian Church. There were false teachers busy amongst them who belonged in some sense to the Christian community. But probably these were not Colossians, but wandering emissaries of a Judaizing Gnosticism, while certainly the great mass of the Church was untouched by their speculations. They were in danger of getting bewildered, and being *deceived*, that is to say, of being induced to accept certain teaching because of its speciousness, without seeing all its bearings, or even knowing its real meaning. So error ever creeps into the Church. Men are caught by something fascinating in some popular teaching, and swallow it without knowing where it will lead them. By slow degrees its tendencies are disclosed, and at last the followers of the heresiarch wake to find that everything which they once believed and prized has dropped from their creed.

We may learn here, too, the true safeguard against specious errors. Paul thinks that he can best fortify these simple-minded disciples against all harmful teaching by exalting his Master and urging the inexhaustible significance of His person and message. To learn the full meaning and preciousness of Christ is to be armed against error. The positive truth concerning Him guards beforehand, by preoccupying mind and heart, against the most specious teachings. If you fill the coffer with gold, nobody will want, and there will be no room for, pinchbeck. A living grasp of Christ will keep us from being swept away by the

current of prevailing popular opinion, which is always much more likely to be wrong than right, and is sure to be exaggerated and one-sided at the best. A personal consciousness of His power and sweetness will give an instinctive repugnance to teaching that would lower His dignity and debase His work. If He be the centre and anchorage of all our thoughts, we shall not be tempted to go elsewhere in search of the "treasures of wisdom and knowledge" which "are hid in Him." He who has found the one pearl of great price, needs no more to go seeking goodly pearls, but only day by day more completely to lose self and give up all else that he may win more and more of Christ his All. If we keep our hearts and minds in communion with our Lord, and have experience of His preciousness, that will preserve us from many a snare, will give us a wisdom beyond much logic, will solve for us many of the questions most hotly debated to-day, and will show us that many more are unimportant and uninteresting to us. And even if we should be led to wrong conclusions on some matters, "if we drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt us."

II. We see here the joy which blended with the anxiety of the solitary prisoner, and encouraged him to warn the Colossians against impending dangers to their faith.

We need not follow the grammatical commentators in their discussion of how Paul comes to invert the natural order here, and to say "joying and beholding," instead of "beholding and rejoicing" as we should expect. No one doubts that what he saw in spirit was the cause of his joy. The old man in his prison, loaded with many cares, compelled to be inactive in the cause which was more to him than life, is yet full of spirit and buoyancy. His prison-letters all partake of that "rejoicing in the Lord," which is the key note of one of them. Old age and apparent failure, and the exhaustion of long labours, and the disappointments and sorrows which almost always

gather like evening clouds round a life as it sinks in the west, had not power to quench his fiery energy or to blunt his keen interest in all the Churches. His cell was like the centre of a telephonic system. Voices spoke from all sides. Every Church was connected with it, and messages were perpetually being brought. Think of him sitting there, eagerly listening, and thrilling with sympathy at each word, so self-oblivious was he, so swallowed up were all personal ends in the care for the Churches, and the swift, deep fellow-feeling with them! Love and interest quickened his insight, and though he was far away, he had them so vividly before him that he was as if a spectator. The joy which he had in the thought of them made him dwell on the thought—so the apparently inverted order of the words may be the natural one and he may have looked all the more fixedly because it gladdened him to look.

What did he see? "Your order." That is unquestionably a military metaphor, drawn probably from his experiences of the Prætorians in his captivity. He had plenty of opportunities of studying both the equipment of the single legionary, who, we may say, sat for his portrait in the 6th chapter of Ephesians, to the prisoner to whom he was chained, and also the perfection of discipline in the whole which made the legion so formidable. It was not a multitude but a unit, "moving altogether if it move at all," as if animated by one will. Paul rejoices to know that the Colossian Church was thus welded into a solid unity.

Further, he beholds "the stedfastness of your faith in Christ." This may be a continuation of the military metaphor, and may mean "the solid front, the close phalanx" which your faith presents. But whether we suppose the figure to be carried on or dropped, we must, I think, recognise that this second point refers rather to the inward condition than to the outward discipline of the Colossians.

Here then is set forth a lofty ideal of the Church, in

two respects. First there is outwardly, an ordered disciplined array; and secondly, there is a stedfast faith.

As to the first, Paul was no martinet, anxious about the pedantry of the parade ground, but he knew the need of organization and drill. Any body of men united in order to carry out a specific purpose have to be organized. That means a place for every man, and every man in his place. It means co-operation to one common end, and therefore division of function and subordination. Order does not merely mean obedience to authority. There may be equal "order" under widely different forms of polity. The legionaries were drawn up in close ranks, the light-armed skirmishers more loosely. In the one case the phalanx was more and the individual less; in the other there was more play given to the single man, and less importance to corporate action; but the difference between them was not that of order and disorder, but that of two systems, each organized but on somewhat different principles and for different purposes. A loosely linked chain is as truly a chain as a rigid one. The main requirement for such "order" as gladdened the Apostle is conjoint action to one end, with variety of office, and unity of spirit.

Some Churches give more weight to the principle of authority; others to that of individuality. They may criticise each other's polity, but the former has no right to reproach the latter as being necessarily defective in "order." Some Churches are all drill, and their favourite idea of discipline is Obey them that have the rule over you. The Churches of looser organization, on the other hand, are no doubt in danger of making too little of organization. But both need that all their members should be more penetrated by the sense of unity, and should fill each his place in the work of the body. It was far easier to secure the true order—a place and a task for every man and every

man in his place and at his task—in the small homogeneous communities of apostolic times than it is now, when men of such different social position, education, and ways of thinking are found in the same Christian community. The proportion of idlers in all Churches is a scandal and a weakness. However highly organized and officered a Church may be, no joy would fill an apostle's heart in beholding it, if the mass of its members had no share in its activities. Every society of professing Christians should be like a man of war's crew, each of whom knows the exact inch where he has to stand when the whistle sounds, and the precise thing he has to do in the gun drill.

But the perfection of discipline is not enough. That may stiffen into routine if there be not something deeper. We want life even more than order. The description of the soldiers who set David on the throne should describe Christ's army—"men that could keep rank, they were not of double heart." They had discipline and had learned to accommodate their stride to their comrades' power; but they had wholehearted enthusiasm, which was better. Both are needed. If there be not courage and devotion there is nothing worth disciplining. The Church that has the most complete order and not also stedfastness of faith will be like the German armies, all pipeclay and drill, which ran like hares before the ragged shoeless levies which the first French Revolution flung across the border with a fierce enthusiasm blazing in their hearts. So the Apostle beholds with joy the stedfastness of the Colossians' faith towards Christ.

If the rendering "stedfastness" be adopted as in the Rev. Ver., the phrase will be equivalent to the "firmness which characterizes or belongs to your faith." But some of the best commentators deny that this meaning of the word is ever found, and propose "foundation" (that which

is made stedfast). The meaning then will either be "the firm foundation (for your lives) which consists of your faith," or, more probably, "the firm foundation which your faith has." He rejoices, seeing that their faith towards Jesus Christ has a basis unshaken by assaults.

Such a rock foundation, and consequent stedfastness, must faith have, if it is to be worthy of the name and to manifest its true power. A tremulous faith may, thank God! be a true faith, but the very idea of faith implies solid assurance and fixed confidence. Our faith should be able to resist pressure and to keep its ground against assaults and gain-saying. It should not be like a child's card castle, that the light breath of a scornful laugh will throw down, but

"a tower of strength

That stands foursquare to all the winds that blow."

We should seek to make it so, nor let the fluctuations of our own hearts cause it to fluctuate. We should try so to control the ebb and flow of religious emotion that it may always be near high water with our faith, a tideless but not stagnant sea. We should oppose a settled conviction and unalterable confidence to the noisy voices which would draw us away.

And that we may do so we must keep up a true and close communion with Jesus Christ. The faith which is ever going out "towards" Him, as the sunflower turns sunwards, will ever draw from Him such blessed gifts that doubt or distrust will be impossible. If we keep near our Lord and wait expectant on Him, He will increase our faith and make our "hearts fixed, trusting in the Lord." So a greater than Paul may speak even to us, as He walks in the midst of the golden candlesticks, words which from *His* lips will be praise indeed: "Though I am absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the spirit, joying and beholding your order and the stedfastness of your faith in Me."

III. We have here, the exhortation which comprehends all duty, and covers the whole ground of Christian belief and practice.

“Therefore”—the following exhortation is based upon the warning and commendation of the preceding verses. There is first a wide general injunction. “As ye received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk in Him,” *i.e.* let your active life be in accord with what you learned and got when you first became Christians. Then this exhortation is defined or broken up into four particulars in the following clauses, which explain in detail how it is to be kept.

The general exhortation is to a true Christian walk. The main force lies upon the “as.” The command is to order all life in accordance with the early lessons and acquisitions. The phrase “ye received Christ Jesus the Lord” presents several points requiring notice. It is obviously parallel with “as ye were taught” in the next verse; so that it was from their first teachers, and probably from Epaphras (i. 7) that they had “received Christ.” So then what we receive, when, from human lips, we hear the gospel and accept it, is not merely the word about the Saviour, but the Saviour Himself. This expression of our text is no mere loose or rhetorical mode of speech, but a literal and blessed truth. Christ is the sum of all Christian teaching and, where the message of His love is welcomed, He Himself comes in spiritual and real presence, and dwells in the spirit.

The solemnity of the full name of our Saviour is most significant in this connexion. Paul reminds the Colossians, in view of the teaching which degraded the person and curtailed the work of Christ, that they had received the man Jesus, the promised Christ, the universal Lord. As if he had said, Remember whom you received in your conversion—*Christ*, the Messiah, anointed, that is, fitted by the unmeasured possession of the Divine Spirit to fulfil all

prophecy and to be the world's deliverer. Remember *Jesus*, the man, our brother;—therefore listen to no misty speculations nor look to whispered mysteries nor to angel hierarchies for knowledge of God or for help in conflict. Our gospel is not theory spun out of men's brains, but is, first and foremost, the history of a brother's life and death. You received *Jesus*, so you are delivered from the tyranny of these unsubstantial and portentous systems, and relegated to the facts of a human life for your knowledge of God. You received Jesus Christ as *Lord*. He was proclaimed as Lord of men, angels, and the universe, Lord and Creator of the spiritual and material worlds, Lord of history and providence. Therefore you need not give heed to those teachers who would fill the gulf between men and God with a crowd of powers and rulers. You have all that your mind or heart or will can need in the human Divine Jesus, who is the Christ and the Lord for you and all men. You have received Him in the all-sufficiency of His revealed nature and offices. You have Him for your very own. Hold fast that which you have, and let no man take this your crown and treasure. The same exhortation has emphatic application to the conflicts of to-day. The Church has had Jesus set forth as Christ and Lord. His manhood, the historical reality of His Incarnation with all its blessed issues, His Messiahship as the fulfiller of prophecy and symbol, designated and fitted by the fulness of the spirit, to be man's deliverer, His rule and authority over all creatures and events have been taught, and the tumults of present unsettlement make it hard and needful to keep true to that threefold belief, and to let nothing rob us of any of the elements of the full gospel which lies in the august name, Christ Jesus the Lord.

To that gospel, to that Lord, the walk, the active life, is to be conformed, and the manner thereof is more fully explained in the following clauses.

“Rooted and built up in Him.” Here again we have the

profound "in Him," which appears so frequently in this and the companion Epistle to the Ephesians, and which must be allowed its proper force, as expressing a most real indwelling of the believer in Christ, if the depth of the meaning is to be sounded.

Paul drives his fiery chariot through rhetorical proprieties, and never shrinks from "mixed metaphors" if they more vigorously express his thought. Here we have three incongruous ones close on each other's heels. The Christian is to *walk*, to be *rooted* like a tree, to be *built up* like a house. What does the incongruity matter to Paul as the stream of thought and feeling hurries him along?

The tenses of the verbs, too, are studiously and significantly varied. Fully rendered they would be "having been rooted and being builded up." The one is a past act done once for all, the effects of which are permanent; the other is a continuous resulting process, which is going on now. The Christian has been rooted in Jesus Christ at the beginning of his Christian course. His faith has brought him into living contact with the Saviour, who has become as the fruitful soil into which the believer sends his roots; and both feeds and anchors there. The familiar image of the first Psalm may have been in the writer's mind, and naturally recurs to ours. If we draw nourishment and stability from Christ, round whom the roots of our being twine and cling, we shall flourish and grow and bear fruit. No man can do without some person beyond himself on whom to repose, nor can any of us find in ourselves or on earth the sufficient soil for our growth. We are like seedlings dropped on some great rock, which send their rootlets down the hard stone and are stunted till they reach the rich leaf-mould at its base. We blindly feel through all the barrenness of the world for something into which our roots may plunge that we may be nourished and firm. In Christ we may be "like a tree planted by the river of water;" out of Him we are

"as the chaff," rootless, lifeless, profitless, and swept at last by the wind from the threshing floor. The choice is before man—either to be rooted in Christ by faith, or to be every rootless.

"Being built up in Him." The gradual continuous building up of the structure of a Christian character is doubly expressed in this word by the present tense which points to a process, and by the prefixed preposition represented by "up," which points to the successive laying of course of masonry upon course. We are the architects of our own characters. If our lives are based on Jesus Christ as their foundation, and every deed is in vital connexion with Him, as at once its motive, its pattern, its power, its aim, and its reward, then we shall build holy and fair lives, which shall be temples. Men do not merely grow as a tree which "grows green and broad, and takes no care." The other metaphor of the building needs to be taken into account, to complete the former. Effort, patient continuous labour must be put forth. More than "forty and six years is this temple in building." A stone at a time is fitted in its place, and so after much toil and many years, as in the case of some mediæval cathedral unfinished for centuries, the topstone is brought forth at last. This choice, too, is before all men—to build on Christ and so to build for eternity, or on sand and so to be crushed below the ruins of our fallen house.

"Stablished in your faith, even as ye were taught." This is apparently simply a more definite way of putting substantially the same thoughts as in the former clauses. Possibly the meaning is "stablished by faith," the Colossians' faith being the instrument of their establishment. But the Revised Version is probably right in its rendering, "stablished in, or as to, your faith." Their faith, as Paul had just been saying, was stedfast, but still it needed yet increased firmness. And this exhortation, as it were, trans-

lates the previous ones into more homely language, that if any man stumbled at the mysticism of the thoughts there, he might grasp the plain practicalness here. If we are established and confirmed in our faith, we shall be rooted and built up in Jesus, for it is faith which joins us to Him, and its increase measures our growth in and into Him.

There then is a very plain practical issue of these deep thoughts of union with Jesus. A progressive increase of our faith is the condition of all Christian progress. The faith which is already the firmest, and by its firmness may gladden an Apostle, is still capable of and needs strengthening. Its range can be enlarged, its tenacity increased, its power over heart and life reinforced. The eye of faith is never so keen but it may become more longsighted; its grasp never so close but it may be tightened; its realization never so solid but it may be more substantial; its authority never so great but it may be made more absolute. This continual strengthening of faith is the most essential form of a Christian's effort at self-improvement. Strengthen faith and you strengthen all graces; for it measures our reception of Divine help.

And the furthest development which faith can attain should ever be sedulously kept in harmony with the initial teaching—"even as ye were taught." Progress does not consist in dropping the early truths of Christ Jesus the Lord for newer wisdom and more speculative religion, but in discovering ever deeper lessons and larger powers in these rudiments which are likewise the last and highest lessons which men can learn.

Further, as the daily effort of the believing soul ought to be to strengthen the quality of his faith, so it should be to increase its amount—"abounding in it with thanksgiving." Or if we adopt the reading of the Revised Version, we shall omit the "in it," and find here only an exhortation to thanksgiving. That is, in any case, the main idea of the clause.

which adds to the former the thought that thanksgiving is an inseparable accompaniment of vigorous Christian life. It is to be called forth, of course, mainly by the great gift of Christ, in whom we are rooted and builded, and, in Paul's judgment it is the very spring of Christian progress.

That constant temper of gratitude implies a habitual presence to the mind, of God's great mercy in His unspeakable gift, a continual glow of heart as we gaze, a continual appropriation of that gift for our very own, and a continual outflow of our heart's love to the Incarnate and Immortal Love. Such thankfulness will bind us to glad obedience, and will give swiftness to the foot and eagerness to the will, to run in the way of God's commandments. It is like genial sunshine, all flowers breathe perfume and fruits ripen under its influence. It is the fire which kindles the sacrifice of life and makes it go up in fragrant incense clouds, acceptable to God. The highest nobleness of which man is capable is reached when, moved by the mercies of God, we yield ourselves living sacrifices, thankofferings to Him who yielded Himself the sin-offering for us. The life which is all influenced by thanksgiving will be pure, strong, happy, in its continual counting of its gifts, in its thoughts of the Giver, and not least happy and beautiful in its glad surrender of itself to Him who has given Himself for and to it. The noblest offering that we can bring, the only recompense which Christ asks, is that our hearts and our lives should say, We thank thee, O Lord. "By Him therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually," and the continual thanksgiving will ensure continuous growth in our Christian character, and a constant increase in the strength and depth of our faith.

ALEXANDER MACLAREN.

SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

THROUGHOUT the whole of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, we hear as it were the distant mutterings of thunder, but the storm never bursts. In the Second Epistle it is raging in full violence around us.

The course of events between these two Epistles is usually explained in a very simple manner. St. Paul, we are told, remained some time at Ephesus in accordance with his expressed purpose (1 Cor. xvi. 8), "I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost." The tumult raised by the silversmith Demetrius, brought his sojourn in that city to an end sooner than he intended; and he then fell back on the plan he had previously formed of going to Corinth by way of Macedonia (1 Cor. xvi. 5). He went first to Troas, where he hoped to meet Titus, who was coming from Macedonia and bringing him tidings of the Church at Corinth (2 Cor. ii. 12, 13). Failing to find Titus there, he went on into Macedonia, where he met him; and in consequence of the good news which Titus brought, Paul sent him back to Corinth with this Second Epistle, in which he states his intention of coming himself shortly to the city with the purpose of wintering there. Everything is thus supposed to have taken place according to the plan indicated in 1 Cor. xvi. 5, 6, and thus scarcely six months elapsed between the two Epistles.

We cannot at all share this view. It seems to us that there are indications in this Second Epistle of a much longer interval between the two letters, and of the rise of much graver complications. We are especially struck with the intervention of a fresh co-worker with Paul, Titus the evangelist, and with the great importance attached to his person and mission. Hitherto the only evangelist mentioned had been Timothy, who, after visiting the Church at Corinth, was to have rejoined Paul at

Ephesus, where the three delegates from the Corinthian Church were also awaiting him. The Apostle wished, no doubt, to confer with them over the report which Timothy would bring (1 Cor. xvi. 11). But here we find Timothy has suddenly vanished and everything depends upon Titus. It is upon him, not Timothy, that Paul is counting for the tidings which are to set his heart at rest as to the state of the Church. Not finding him, he is so anxious that he hurries into Macedonia to meet him. It has been conjectured that Timothy had been prevented from going to Corinth (indeed Paul only speaks doubtfully of his expected visit, 1 Cor. xvi. 10), and that after his return to Ephesus Paul had sent Titus instead of him to Corinth. But how is it we find no hint of this in the whole of the Second Epistle, if it were really so? Or, as an alternative, it might be conjectured that it was Titus, not Timothy, who had been the bearer of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. But then how is it that Paul makes no mention of him in that letter, but only of Timothy?

Nor is this the only remarkable circumstance, supposing the facts to have been as suggested above.

In the Second Epistle to the Corinthians there are certain passages in which Paul alludes to a letter of severe rebuke which, with great pain to himself, he had been forced to write to them, and which was to serve instead of an intended visit. "I wrote this very thing, lest, when I came, I should have sorrow from them of whom I ought to rejoice. . . . For out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote unto you with many tears; not that ye should be made sorry, but that ye might know the love which I have more abundantly unto you" (2 Cor. ii. 3, 4). In chapter vii. he says (8-10) that after he had sent the letter he rather regretted it; but he regrets it no longer, now that he sees the effect it has produced. Would such expressions apply to the First Epistle to the Cor-

inthians? This seems to us impossible. That letter does indeed contain many stern passages, but none which would bear out such a reference as is here made. We should search in vain in the First Epistle for a chapter which must have been wrung from the heart of the Apostle with many tears. Further, it appears from certain expressions in the Second Epistle that the Apostle had received some grave personal offence from the Church of Corinth. He declares (chap. ii. 10) that he is quite ready to forgive him who has been guilty of the offence, and that if the Corinthians can forgive so can he. In chapter vii. 12 he says that he has written to them "not for his cause that did the wrong, nor for his cause that suffered the wrong," but that they might know the earnest care which he, Paul, had for them in the sight of God. It has often been thought that the man to whom Paul refers in these passages was the one who had been guilty of incest referred to in 1 Cor. v.; but in that case the person who suffered the wrong could be no other than the father of the offender. But could Paul say in this case that he had not written for his sake that did the wrong? Does he not say that it was in order that his spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus that he had penned that fifth chapter? and could he here say that he regarded such a crime only from the standpoint of the wrong done to the father of the guilty man? Can we indeed suppose it possible that such an offence could have been committed in the very lifetime of the father? No; in these two passages the offended person can be no other than Paul himself. He means to say that he has not written this severe letter to get the man punished who had done him wrong, and thus to appease his own wounded pride, but for the good of the Church itself. Now how could the Apostle refer to the offence as done to himself, if he were alluding to this crime of incest? These passages must refer to some fact of

which we find no trace in the First Epistle, and which must have taken place in the interval between the two letters.

We may refer further to three passages in the Second Epistle, which speak of Paul's expected visit to Corinth as the third to that city. So far as we have seen at present, this coming visit would be only the second; since after founding the Church at Corinth, Paul had taken up his abode at Ephesus, where, according to the narrative in the Acts, he laboured from that time without interruption. It has been sometimes supposed that before writing the First Epistle to the Corinthians he had made from Ephesus, a rapid journey into Greece and Achaia, not mentioned in the Book of Acts. But there would surely then be some allusion to it in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, as he refers so frequently in that letter to the circumstances of his first visit. And how could it be said at Corinth that he dared not show himself there (1 Cor. iv. 18-21), if he had been there quite recently? Another conjecture has been, that the passages which seem to imply a second visit of Paul, refer only to a projected and promised visit which never really came to pass. This explanation might possibly be admissible for 2 Cor. xiii. 1, but cannot apply to 2 Cor. xii. 14. An attempt has indeed been made to translate this passage: "Behold this is the third time I am on the point of coming to you"; which would not necessarily imply that he had already been twice. But the words which follow: "I will not be a burden to you," intimating as they do that again this time he will not accept the hospitality of any of them, do not admit of this interpretation. They imply that the two previous visits to which he refers in ver. 14, are actual and not merely intended comings. People do not live at others' charges in merely hypothetical visits. The expression "*for the third time*" must refer then to the actual coming and not to the being *on the point of coming*. In chapter ii. 1

we find another passage no less decisive: "I determined this for myself, that I would not come again to you with sorrow," says the Apostle. On his first visit, when he founded the Church, Paul had had abundant labours and trials from without, but for all that he would not have described that visit as a sorrowful one. Between that first coming and the visit he was now projecting, there had then been another very painful to him, and such as he did not desire to repeat.

If we now sum up the hints contained in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians as to the state of things in the Church as the result of the First Epistle, we shall be startled at the gravity of the situation.

There were certain men, whom we cannot fail to identify as those who with their followers claimed to be "of Christ" (see 2 Cor. x. 7; xi. 23), who attacked at once the apostleship, the character, and the teaching of the founder of the Church. "He has not even seen the Lord Jesus," said they, "and yet he gives himself out to be His apostle" (1 Cor. ix. 1; 2 Cor. v. 16). "He is so conscious of the inferiority of his position as regards the other apostles, that he dares not make himself chargeable to the Churches as they did (1 Cor. ix. 5; 2 Cor. xi. 7 ff; xii. 13). He boasts of his disinterestedness, but so crafty is he that he manages to secure his own profit in another manner, by means of his messengers and collections which he gathers professedly for the poor at Jerusalem (1 Cor. xiv. 1-4; 2 Cor. i. 15, 16). He writes powerful threatening letters, but never comes to carry out his threats, or if he does appear, 'his bodily presence is weak and his speech of no account' (1 Cor. iv. 18; 2 Cor. x. 10). His letters are one long strain of boasting; his head is turned with pride (2 Cor. iii. 1; v. 13; xi. 1). For the rest, his teaching is of little value. There are others immeasurably more gifted in speech (2 Cor. x. 10; xi. 6)."

What could the Apostle say or do after such crushing criticism as this? There must surely be an end of him and his work. The Church must be left now to pass into the hands of his adversaries.

We need to realize to ourselves the gravity of the situation in order to understand the events which follow as we shall attempt to reproduce them, and through them to bring out the real meaning of this Second Epistle. The Apostle awaited at Ephesus the return of Timothy, and in consequence of the interviews he had with him and with the three delegates of the Church, he decided to revert to his first plan (which from 1 Cor. xvi. 5 he seemed to have abandoned), and to go direct to Corinth from Ephesus. This visit was a short and painful one, and Paul is referring to it (2 Cor. ii. 1), when he says, "I determined this for myself, that I would not come *again* to you with sorrow." The germs of disaffection towards himself had been growing. The severe and humiliating passages in his first letter had been craftily turned to account, and things had come to such a point that he was made the subject of gross insult without the Church raising a finger in his defence. Feeling that he could not himself insist on the reparation which was due to him, he went away to leave the Church time to act, saying however that he should come back again. He travelled into Macedonia, and perhaps as far as Illyricum on the shores of the Adriatic (Rom. xv. 19). He waited for news of the conduct of the Church. At length, hearing nothing to reassure him, he decided to write this severe and painful letter, watered abundantly with tears, of which he speaks in this Second Epistle. In it he made the Corinthians feel, what they ought to have felt without any such prompting—how much they owed to him; and he gave them their choice between a rupture with him and the punishment of the offenders. The important mission of conveying this letter and supporting it, he committed to

Titus, who was then with him. Then, having no more to do in Macedonia, and not being willing to return to Corinth while matters were in this position, he went back to Ephesus, where it would seem Timothy was grappling with a task beyond his strength. To this time refer the words in this Second Epistle (2 Cor. i. 23; ii. 3): "I call God for a witness upon my soul, that to spare you I forbore to come unto Corinth. . . . And I wrote this very thing (these severe reprimands), lest, when I came, I should have sorrow from them of whom I ought to rejoice."

It is, as we think, to this failure to come back as he had promised, that Paul refers in the justification which he gives of his conduct, 2 Cor. i. 17, 18.

At Ephesus Paul awaited, in much perplexity of spirit, the return of Titus. It was no doubt in this interval that the tumult was raised by Demetrius which nearly cost the Apostle his life, and to this time of trouble and deliverance he refers, as we think, in 2 Cor. i. 8-11. Having escaped this danger, the Apostle starts for the north on the route on which he hopes to meet with Titus. If to the two years and three months of his first stay in Ephesus, we add the few months of this second visit, we get the three years during which, as he says to the Ephesian elders (Acts xx. 31), he had worked and watched for souls in that city. This unexpected prolongation of his stay in Ephesus seems to explain the singular expression (Acts xix. 22) with which the story of the tumult in the city is prefaced. "He himself stayed in Asia for a season." It would not have been possible for him to go west, leaving the Church of Corinth in such a position towards himself as it was at that time.

Arrived at Troas, he failed to find there Titus, the brother whom he was yearning to see (2 Cor. ii. 13): and in his anxiety (for the welfare of the most flourishing of all his Churches was at stake) he went into Macedonia to meet

him. There at length they met, and the news from Corinth filled him with joy. Titus himself was quite reassured by what he had seen and heard, and Paul was so relieved that he resolved at once to send back this faithful fellow-labourer to convey the expression of his satisfaction, and to complete the work of reconciliation before the Apostle came again to pay one final glad visit to the Church and then to leave it for ever.

This Second Epistle to the Corinthians is then, properly speaking, the *Fourth*; for, as we have already seen, that which is called the *First* Epistle had been preceded by a letter which we have lost, and between the first and second we must suppose a third, which, like the first, has not come down to us, probably because both were altogether of a local and incidental character. If things took place at all as we have supposed, they imply an interval not of six but of eighteen months between our First and Second Epistles, namely, from the spring of 57 to the autumn of 58.

The Apostle, writing to the Church in the position we have described, had two main objects in view; first, to testify his satisfaction and gratitude to the majority in the Church who had so warmly taken up his cause and now rendered possible this happy visit to which he had so long been looking forward; and next, to remove all the germs of disobedience and disorder which still remained in the Church, and which might again spring up to trouble him. In a word it may be said, his design was so to strengthen the spiritual bond which united him to the true-hearted majority in the Church, that the still disaffected minority might be powerless to break it. In addition to this, he may have had some special object in view, such as the success of the collection with which he was determined to close his ministry in the East, and which was to be to the Christians in Palestine the tangible proof of the new life awakened in the Gentile world.

In this way we explain the three parts into which this Epistle naturally divides itself. The first seven chapters are addressed specially to the section of the Church which was in sympathy with the Apostle, and their purport is to let them know how his heart has been exercised towards them under the recent crisis. This portion of the letter refers to the *past*. Chapters viii. ix. form a second part, the object of which is to encourage the faithful majority to take an active part in the collection, which is already almost finished in Macedonia. It is with this view that he sends Titus back to them with his letter. This part of the Epistle deals then with the time *present*. Lastly, in chapters x.-xiii. the Apostle, while still addressing himself to the whole Church (because he will not himself create one of those divisions for which he has been reproving them) turns specially to the disobedient members, showing them how they have been made the tools of intriguing men, and how severely he will have to deal with them if they persist in their hostile attitude and wicked conduct till he comes again. This third portion relates to the *future*.

Such is the natural and simple division of this Epistle. For want of understanding this, doubts have often been thrown upon its unity, and it has been sometimes supposed to be a collection of fragments composed at different times, with different objects and even by various authors.

The whole Epistle follows the historical order.

Paul, and Timothy, who rejoined him in Macedonia, address themselves expressly not only to the Christians at Corinth, but to those of the whole province of Achaia, over which the Gospel had spread since their first sojourn in that district. The Apostle desires first of all that the Church should rejoice with him in his wonderful deliverance from imminent death. He is referring, no doubt, to the tumult excited by Demetrius at Ephesus. He points out to his readers how under God these painful experiences,

through which he is called to pass, become the means of making his ministry more fruitful to the Church, so close is the spiritual union between them (2 Cor. i. 1-11). After this he explains the change in his purpose of coming to them, which his enemies at Corinth had used as a handle against him. It is generally supposed that the reference is to the change mentioned by the Apostle (1 Cor. xvi. 5). But to us it seems that he is alluding to a more recent change: for in the former case he would have said (chap. i. 23), not "I forbore to come unto Corinth" (οὐκέτι), but "I came not *yet* (οὐπω) to Corinth." The word οὐκέτι (no more) implies that he had already been there once, but that he had not returned as he had promised. And we have seen already that after going from Ephesus to Corinth and thence into Macedonia, instead of returning thence to Corinth for the long stay he had promised, he had returned into Asia and settled down again at Ephesus. Why then did he not come back? This is the seeming inconsistency in his conduct which he must explain, for he knows that it will be used against him. He even resorts to a solemn asseveration, calling God to witness, that, if he returned into Asia without visiting Corinth, as he had promised, it was not through fickleness or fear for himself, but because the state their Church was hindered in him. He would rather write the sharp things he has to say to them than come and say them himself. This explains at once the reason of his not coming back and the purport of that severe letter which he had sent them by Titus when he left Macedonia to go back to Ephesus (chap. i. 12-ii. 4). In reference to that letter, he speaks here *en passant* of the punishment of the guilty one administered by the majority of the Church, as the result of Paul's letter, and urges that great indulgence be shown to him, lest Satan, who had tempted him to sin through arrogance, should now let him be swallowed up of overmuch sorrow. If the Corinthians forgave him, they

may be assured that the Apostle forgives also. As we have already seen, such words could only refer to a personal offence committed against Paul himself, and not to the sin of incest (chap. ii. 5-11). From this explanation of the reasons which led him to go back to Asia without visiting Corinth, Paul passes to the account of his recent departure from Ephesus for Troas, and makes the Church feel the greatness of his love for her by his description of all the anguish of mind he was enduring at that time on her account. Not having met Titus at Troas, as he had hoped, he gave up his idea of evangelizing in that district as the way opened, and in his anxiety hastened into Macedonia to meet Titus (chap. ii. 13). Here he lays open the depths of his soul to his readers. He shows them what are the feelings of a true servant of Christ in the fulfilment of his ministry. And first, he initiates his readers into the secret of spiritual power in that ministry, that they may see how needless it is for him to have recourse to the dishonest artifices which the preachers of a legal Christianity are obliged to use. In order to conceal the fact that the reign of law is over, they are constrained to employ some such means as Moses, who put a veil over his face that the people might not see the fading away of its glory.¹ The true servant of Christ beholds his Lord with unveiled face, and being clothed himself with the same beauty, he has nothing to hide (chap. ii. 14-iv. 6). In this admirable passage on the ministry of the spirit, as opposed to the ministry of the letter (of the law), there is the opening of the attack upon the Judaizing teachers, but the battle, properly speaking, is reserved for the end of the letter.

F. GODET.

(To be concluded.)

¹ Not that the Apostle would thus insinuate anything against the character of Moses. When he acted thus, the time was not yet come for Israel to understand the transitory character of the legal economy and its future abolition. It was otherwise at the time when Paul wrote, and when his adversaries were seeking to prolong the Mosaic dispensation, which had really closed with the advent of Messiah.

*DR. MOMMSEN ON THE NERONIAN REFERENCE
OF THE APOCALYPSE, AND ON THE "ITALA."*

PROFESSOR MOMMSEN, in the fifth volume lately issued of his *History of Rome*, has a chapter on "Judæa and the Jews," in the course of which he mentions the attempt of Caligula to have his statue set up in the Holy of Holies, and the horror with which the Jews contemplated the possibility of the profanation of Antiochus Epiphanes being repeated. "It had been done," he remarks, "once already a like proceeding of the king of Syria, Antiochus Epiphanes, had been followed by the rising of the Maccabees and the victorious restoration of the free national state. This Epiphanes—the Anti-Messiah who ushers in the Messiah, as the prophet Daniel had, certainly after the event, delineated him—was thenceforth to every Jew the prototype of abomination; it was no matter of indifference that the same conception came to be with equal warrant attached to a Roman emperor, or rather to the image of the Roman ruler in general. Since that fateful edict [of Caligula] the Jews never ceased to dread that another emperor might issue a like command, and so far certainly with reason, as according to the organization of the Roman polity such an enactment depended solely on the momentary pleasure of the ruler for the time." And he adds, "This Jewish hatred of the worship of the emperor and of imperialism itself is depicted with glowing colours in the Apocalypse of John, for which, chiefly on that account, Rome is the harlot of Babylon and the common enemy of mankind."

In support of the view thus expressed, Dr. Mommsen subjoins a pretty long note, which may be interesting to the readers of the *EXPOSITOR*, as exhibiting the considerably altered form, in which the theory—so much discussed of late years by M. Renan, Dr. Farrar, and others, most recently

and ably by Dr. Salmon in his Introduction to the New Testament—of the Neronian reference of the Apocalypse commends itself to one who looks at the matter from another standpoint than that of the ordinary commentator or theologian.

“This is perhaps the right way of apprehending the Jewish conceptions, in which the positive facts regularly run away into generalities. In the accounts of the Anti-Messias and of the Antichrist no positive elements are found to suit the emperor Gaius; the view that would explain the name Armillus, which the Talmud assigns to the former, by the circumstance that the emperor Gaius sometimes wore women’s bracelets (*armillæ*, Suetonius, *Gai.*, 52), cannot be seriously maintained. In the Apocalypse of John—the classical revelation of Jewish self-esteem and hatred towards the Romans—the picture of the Anti-Messias is associated rather with Nero, who did not cause his image to be set up in the Holy of Holies. This composition belongs, as is well-known, to a time and a tendency which still viewed Christianity as essentially a Jewish sect. Those elected and marked by the angel are all Jews, 12,000 from each of the twelve tribes, and have precedence over the ‘great multitude of other righteous ones,’ *i.e.* of proselytes (chap. vii.; comp. chap. xii. 1). It was written, demonstrably, after Nero’s fall, and when his return from the East was expected. Now it is true that a pseudo-Nero appeared immediately after the death of the real one, and was executed at the beginning of the following year (Tacitus, *Hist.*, ii. 8, 9); but it is not of this one that John is thinking, for the very exact account makes no mention, as John does, of the Parthians, and for John there is a considerable interval between the fall of Nero and his return, the latter still lying in the future. His Nero is the person, [in reality a certain Terentius Maximus from Asia Minor], who under Vespasian found adherents in the region of the

Euphrates, whom King Artabanus acknowledged under Titus and prepared to reinstate in Rome by military force, and whom at length the Parthians surrendered, after prolonged negotiations, about the year 88, to Domitian. To these events the Apocalypse corresponds quite exactly. On the other hand, in a writing of this stamp no inference as to the state of the siege at the time can possibly be drawn from the circumstance that according to xi. 1, 2, only the outer court, and not the Holy of Holies, of the Temple of Jerusalem was given into the power of the heathen; here everything in the details is imaginary [*Phantasmagorie*], and this trait is certainly either invented at pleasure or, if the view be preferred, possibly based on orders given to the Roman soldiers, who were encamped in Jerusalem after its destruction, not to set foot in what was formerly the Holy of Holies. The foundation of the Apocalypse is indisputably the destruction of the earthly Jerusalem, and the prospect thereby for the first time opened up of its future ideal restoration; in place of the razing of the city that had taken place there cannot possibly be put the mere expectation of the capture. If, then, it is said of the seven heads of the dragon βασιλεῖς ἑπτὰ εἰσιν· οἱ πέντε ἔπεσαν, ὁ εἰς ἐστίν, ὁ ἄλλος οὐπω ἦλθεν, καὶ ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὀλίγον αὐτὸν δεῖ μεῖναι (xvii. 10), the five, presumably, are Augustus, Tiberius, Gaius, Claudius, Nero, the sixth Vespasian, the seventh undefined; 'the beast which was, and is not, and is itself the eighth, but of the seven,' is, of course, Nero. The undefined seventh is incongruous, like so much in this gorgeous but contradictory and often tangled imagery; and it is added, not because the number seven was employed, which was easily to be got at by including Cæsar, but because the writer hesitated to predicate immediately of the reigning emperor the short government of the last ruler and his overthrow by the returning Nero. But one cannot possibly—as is done after others by Renan—by including

Cæsar in the reckoning, recognise in the sixth emperor, 'who is,' Nero, who immediately afterward is designated as he, who 'was and is not,' and in the seventh, who 'has not yet come and will not rule long,' even the aged Galba, who, according to Renan's view, was ruling at the time. It is clear that the latter does not belong at all to such a series, any more than Otho and Vitellius.

"It is more important, however, to oppose the current conception, according to which the polemic is directed against the Neronian persecution of the Christians and the siege or the destruction of Jerusalem, whereas it is pointed withal against the Roman provincial government generally, and in particular against the worship of the emperors. If of the seven emperors Nero alone is named (by his numerical expression), this is so, not because he was the worst of the seven, but because the naming of the reigning emperor, while prophesying a speedy end of his reign in a published writing, had its risk, and some consideration towards the one 'who is' besseems even a prophet. Nero's name was given up, and besides, the legend of his healing and of his return was in every one's mouth; thereby he has become for the Apocalypse the representative of the Roman imperial rule, and the Antichrist. The crime of the monster of the sea, and of his image and instrument, the monster of the land, is not the violence to the city of Jerusalem (chap. xi. 2),—which appears not as their misdeed, but rather as a portion of the world-judgment (in which case also consideration for the reigning emperor may have been at work)—but the divine worship, which the heathen pay to the monster of the sea (xiii. 8: προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς), and which the monster of the land—called for that reason also the false-prophet—demands and compels for that of the sea (xiii. 12: ποιεῖ τὴν γῆν καὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν αὐτῇ ἵνα προσκυνήσουσιν τὸ θηρίον τὸ πρῶτον, οὗ ἐθεραπεύθη ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ); above all,

he is upbraided with the desire to make an image for the former (xiii. 14 : λέγων τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ποιῆσαι εἰκόνα τῷ θηρίῳ ὃς ἔχει τὴν πληγὴν τῆς μαχαίρης καὶ ἔζησεν, comp. xiv. 9; xvi. 2; xix. 20). This, it is plain, is partly the imperial government beyond the sea, partly the lieutenancy on the Asiatic continent, not of this or that province or even of this or that person, but generally such representation of the emperor, as the provincials of Asia and Syria knew. If trade and commerce appear associated with the use of the *χάραγμα* of the monster of the sea (xiii. 16, 17), there lies clearly at bottom an abhorrence of the image and legend of the imperial money—certainly transformed in a fanciful way, as in fact Satan makes the image of the emperor speak. These very governors appear afterwards (xvii.) as the ten horns, which are assigned to the monster in its copy, and are here called, quite correctly, the ‘ten kings, which have not the royal dignity, but have authority like kings;’ the number, which is taken over from the vision of Daniel, may not, it is true, be taken too strictly. In the sentences of death which are pronounced over the righteous, John is thinking of the regular judicial procedure on account of the refusal to worship the emperor’s image, such as the Letters of Pliny describe (xiii. 15 : ποιήσῃ ἵνα ὅσοι ἐὰν μὴ προσκυνήσωσιν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ θηρίου ἀποκτανθῶσιν, comp. vi. 9; xx. 4). When stress is laid on these sentences of death being executed with special frequency in Rome (xvii. 6; xvii. 24), what is thereby meant is the execution of sentences wherein men were condemned to fight as gladiators or with wild beasts, which often could not take place on the spot where they were pronounced, and, as is well-known, took place chiefly in Rome itself (Modestinus, *Dig.*, xlviii. 19, 31). The Neronian executions on account of alleged incendiarism do not formally belong to the class of religious processes at all, and it is only prepossession that can refer the martyrs’ blood shed in Rome,

of which John speaks, exclusively or pre-eminently to these events. The current conceptions as to the so-called persecutions of the Christians labour under a defective apprehension of the rule of law and the practice of law that subsisted in the Roman empire; in reality the persecution of Christians was a standing matter as was that of robbers; only such regulations were put into practice at times more gently or even negligently, at other times more strictly, and were doubtless on occasion specially enforced from high quarters. The 'war against the saints' is only a subsequent interpolation on the part of some, for whom John's words did not suffice (xiii. 7). The Apocalypse is a remarkable evidence of the national and religious hatred of the Jews towards the Occidental government; but to illustrate with these colours the Neronian tale of horrors, as Renan does in particular, is to shift the place of the facts and to detract from their depth of significance. The Jewish national hatred did not wait for the conquest of Jerusalem to originate it, and it made, as might be expected, no distinction between the good and the bad Cæsar; its Anti-Messias bore the name of Nero, doubtless, but not less that of Vespasian or of Marcus."

We may briefly indicate some of the points in which the view here given differs from those put forward by Dr. Farrar and M. Renan. While they all agree in the reference to Nero and to the expectation of his return, and in that exposition of the number 666, which Dr. Salmon has assailed afresh with argument and sarcasm, they differ as to the date of the work. M. Renan and Dr. Farrar place it before the destruction of Jerusalem, and assign it to the short reign of Galba; while Dr. Mommsen places it after the destruction of the city, and refers it apparently to the latter years of Vespasian. He disposes, after a fashion more summary than satisfactory, of the passage which points to the subsistence of the Temple (xi. 1, 2), by assuming that

here the details are drawn from the writer's imagination, which is the very point in question. His suggestion, on the other hand, that Galba is not of sufficient account to be included, any more than Otho or Vitellius, in the list of emperors, may claim to be countenanced by Dr. Farrar's admission, that "Galba, Otho, and Vitellius passed like phantoms across the imperial stage," and that "it is not impossible that Vespasian may have been regarded by the Apostle as really the sixth emperor" (*Early Christ.*, ii. p. 195; see also p. 315). As regards the false Nero who is assumed as referred to, M. Renan, while not absolutely pronouncing against the opinion that Nero was with the Parthians, "readily admits that John in Patmos had knowledge of the events in the neighbouring isle of Cythnos," and finds the principal cause of his writing in the strange rumours as to the *soi-disant* Nero who established himself there for a time in 68-69 (*Antechrist*, pp. 436-439); and Dr. Farrar seems to lean to this view when he remarks, "It is probable that one of these was making himself extremely formidable in the very region in which St. John was writing, and at that very time." This is the pseudo-Nero referred to in the detailed account of Tacitus, *Hist.*, ii. 8, 9. and Zonaras, xi. 15; but Dr. Mommsen considers that the Apocalypse points to a later pretender emerging in the East under Vespasian, and spoken of in Tacitus, *Hist.*, i. 2; Suetonius, *Nero*, 57; and Zonaras, xi. 18. In all these passages there is special mention of the Parthians, which helps to explain the Apocalyptic allusions to the Euphrates (ix. 14; xvi. 12). Dr. Farrar finds an argument for his interpretation of the false prophet as Vespasian in the view that "the forbidding all to buy or sell who have not got the mark of the beast," points to Vespasian's prohibition of exports from Alexandria, in order to starve Rome. Dr. Mommsen here so far agrees with M. Renan as to see a reference to the Roman currency bearing the effigy and legend of the em-

perors, which the Jews abhorred because of its connexion with blasphemous claims to Divine homage. Dr. Salmon's objection, that our Lord, when He asked, "Whose is this image and superscription?" indicates no censure on that score, can hardly, perhaps, be held fully applicable to a period and a state of things when such claims had been more openly and offensively put forward.

The most striking features in Dr. Mommsen's theory are the stress laid by him on the antagonism of the Apocalypse not merely to the imperial system, and to the *cultus* of the emperor generally, but to the representation and embodiment of them in the government of the Asiatic provinces; and the ingenious, but not adequately successful, grounds on which he seeks to discharge from the picture those colours of the Neronian persecution which M. Renan may have exaggerated, but which are stamped too deeply and vividly to be mistaken.

NOTE ON THE "ITALA."

"How far our Latin texts of the Bible are to be referred to several translations originally different, or whether, as Lachmann assumed, the different recensions have proceeded from one and the same translation as a basis, subjected to manifold revision with the aid of the originals, are questions which can scarcely be definitely decided—for the present at least—in favour of either one or the other view. But that both Italians and Africans took part in this work—whether of translation, or of correction—is proved by the famous words of Augustine, *De doct. Christ.*, ii. 15, 22; *in ipsis autem interpretationibus Itala ceteris præferatur, nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiæ*, over which great authorities have been perplexed, but certainly without reason. Bentley's proposal, approved afresh of late (by Corssen, *Jahrb. für Protestant. Theol.*, vii. p. 507 f.), to change *Itala* into *illa* and *nam* into *quæ*, is inadmissible

alike philologically and as to substance. For the twofold change is destitute of all external probability, and besides *nam* is protected by the copyist Isidorus, *Etym.*, vi. 4, 2. The further objection, that linguistic usage would require *Italica*, is not borne out (*e.g.* Sidonius and Jordanes, as well as the inscriptions of later times, *C. I. L.*, x. p. 1146, write *Itala* by turns with *Italica*), and the description of a single translation as the most trustworthy, on the whole is quite consistent with the advice to consult as many as possible; whereas by the change proposed a rational remark is converted into a meaningless commonplace. It is true that the Christian Church in Rome in the first three centuries made use throughout of the Greek language, and that we may not seek there for the *Itali* who took part in the Latin Bible. But that in Italy outside of Rome, especially in Upper Italy, the knowledge of Greek was not much more diffused than in Africa, is most clearly shown by the names of freedmen; and it is just to the non-Roman Italy that the designation used by Augustine points. We may perhaps also call to mind the fact that Augustine was gained for Christianity by Ambrosius in Milan. The attempt to identify the traces of the recension called by Augustine *Itala* in such remains as have survived of Bible translations before Jerome's will at all events hardly ever be successful; but still less will it admit of being proved, that Africans only worked at the pre-Hieronymian Latin Bible-texts. That they originated in great part—perhaps mostly—in Africa, has certainly great probability. The contrast to the one *Itala* can only in reason have been several *Afrae*; and the vulgar Latin, in which these texts are all of them written, is in full agreement with the vulgar Latin, as it was demonstrably spoken in Africa. At the same time we must doubtless not overlook the fact that we know the vulgar Latin at all principally from African sources, and that the proof of the restriction of any indi-

vidual linguistic phenomenon to Africa is as necessary, as it is for the most part unadduced. There existed side by side as well vulgarisms in general use as African provincialisms (comp. *Eph. epigr.*, iv. p. 520, as to the cognomina in *-osus*); but that forms like *glorificare*, *nudificare*, *justificare* belong to the second category, is by no means proved from the fact that we first meet with them in Africa, since analogous documents to those which we possess *e.g.* for Carthage in the case of Tertullian, are wanting to us for Capua and Milan."

WILLIAM P. DICKSON.

DR. M. M. KALISCH.

THE writer of these lines was not personally acquainted with the late M. M. Kalisch, whose decease at the early age (for a scholar) of fifty-seven, has been chronicled in the newspapers. That he came to this country as a political refugee in the fateful year 1848, and that his literary labours, facilitated by the munificence of the Rothschilds, were bravely continued to the last amidst the drawbacks of impaired health, are facts open to all, and only repeated here, because they throw a bright light on a remarkable career. Dr. Kalisch was more than a scholar, more than a Jewish theologian; he felt that there were deeper questions than the criticism of the Pentateuch, and wider interests than those even of his own œcumenical Jewish Church. But he could bear to dwell habitually in the lowlands of patient research, and to regard this assignment of work as more than a compensation for the seclusion involved in his ill-health. Few men have been bolder in their generalizations, none more unweariable in their amassment of minute philological and historical facts.

"A dry, cold rationalist, and the author of a Hebrew Grammar." Such somewhere is the obituary notice of the brave combatant who has passed away. He *did* take the

side of rationalism, and he *was* a meritorious grammarian. In so far as rationalism is a struggle for the right of critical exegesis, these two titles to remembrance—rationalism and a grammar—may not improperly be combined. Dr. Kalisch held that “the grammar is only the vestibule of the temple which enshrines the literature,” and in earnest words bids the student hasten to “the sunny elevation, where the Divine presence breathes in the eternal words of Scripture” (Preface to Part I. of his *Hebrew Grammar*). No recent Hebrew grammar, written in English, has been of such wide utility as the two parts of this grammar; the abundance of facts, the well graduated exercises, and the attention to syntax, are excellent and not too common features, partly counterbalanced, however, by an imperfect sympathy with modern scientific methods. But though the grammar is the most extensively used of his works, it is no doubt his exegetical series which Dr. Kalisch would have pointed to as his monument. His first commentary, that on the Book of Exodus, was published in 1855, and would now be reckoned orthodox and conservative; his second, that on Genesis, appeared in 1858, and distinctly recognised the principles of modern analytic criticism; the third, on the first part of Leviticus (1867), and the fourth, completing that book (1872), took up the most “advanced” position both in criticism and, unhappily, in theology. The *Exodus* and *Genesis* have not yet been superseded by any English work. Much indeed has been contributed to the study of the Hebrew *origines* since they were written, but a student unacquainted with German can hardly afford to neglect them; the *Genesis* in particular is animated by a noble idealism which reminds us forcibly of Eichhorn and Ewald. Of the *Leviticus* it were perhaps best to say nothing; in presence of a fresh grave, words of cold criticism would jar on the ear. It is important, however, to notice that independently of Christian scholars, this open-minded Jewish critic maintains the

theory, revived in our time by Graf, and developed with such brilliancy by Wellhausen, that the Levitical legislation is of post-exile origin.

Slender in form, compared with the too bulky Pentateuch commentaries, the *Bible Studies* on the Prophecies of Balaam (1877), and on the Book of Jonah (1878), are nevertheless full of important matter, especially for the historical illustration of these very peculiar and disputed portions of the Old Testament. The example set by Dr. Kalisch is worthy of being followed. The composite character of the Old Testament makes it absolutely necessary to facilitate the enjoyment of its separate parts by treating of them in separate works. The Book of Jonah is unlike any other member of the prophetic canon; its interest is not less peculiar than its difficulty. The rationalistic explanation of the story of Jonah is, of course, that of Dr. Kalisch, but there is nothing new in the form which he gives to it. The preliminary essay on the relations of Jew and heathen is however a masterly historical study, which acquires fresh significance in view of recent melancholy events. Perhaps however the *Balaam* is intrinsically a finer piece of work. The notes and illustrations are as copious as usual, and the use made of Assyriology is very creditable, considering that Assyriology was entirely a new field to the author. But the really remarkable part of the book is its treatment of the character of Balaam, which has hardly attracted the notice of Christian theologians. Even Dr. Samuel Cox seems to have overlooked it. According to Dr. Kalisch, the character of Balaam is "an inexplicable mystery to all who fail to separate between two antagonistic traditions" (one of which was favourable, the other adverse to Balaam). For his own part, believing that two views are propounded in the Bible, he thinks himself at liberty to select that which he deems the nobler. He sees in it a beautiful and enlightened recognition of God's communion with the choicer spirits of the

"Gentile" races, akin to that which a prince among the prophets expresses in the passages on Cyrus the Persian. Dr. Kalisch has evidently a strong interest in the comparative study of religions, and no object is so dear to him as the growth of mutual respect and sympathy among religionists of various schools. This leads us to notice the remarkable and well-written work which, in the form of a Platonic dialogue, discusses the old problems of the "highest good." *Path and Goal* appeared in 1880, and only failed to obtain a merited success by its over-thoroughness, and a certain want of relief to the grave and debatable subjects of the philosophic discussion. To a student its value is great from its sympathetic exhibition of opposing points of view—Greek philosophical, modern scientific, Brahman, Brahmoist, Buddhist, Parsee, Mohammedan, Jewish liberal and orthodox, Christian liberal and orthodox. It is impossible to doubt that the host, at whose house the guests assemble, represents the opinions of Dr. Kalisch himself, and that the latter believed himself to have devised "a general view, which combined and kept in equipoise Hebrew, Greek, and modern thought, and which did justice both to the varied aspirations of human nature and the complex course of universal history" (p. 3). This reminds us of the eloquent passage which concludes Max Müller's volume of *Hibbert Lectures*. Neither of these great scholars agrees with those who look for a universal religion composed of that which all religious men even now believe in common. Max Müller, for instance, allows that in the future each "crypt worshipper" will still have his own "pearl of great price," and "Mondoza" almost makes the same admission. The rationalism of Dr. Kalisch is therefore neither dry nor cold, though to all whose "pearl of great price" is not merely a truth, but a complex of truths vivified in the person of Jesus, it is, and must be, unsatisfying.

T. K. CHEYNE.

BREVIA.

Dr. Marcus Dods on the Parables of our Lord.¹—Dr. Dods has now finished his homiletic exposition of the Parables with a volume on those recorded by St. Luke. As our readers have had an opportunity of perusing in the *EXPOSITOR* two of these fine discourses, it is needless to say that the completed work is incomparably the best of its kind in the English language, indispensable to preachers, and sure to be widely useful to others. It is a book which will not soon or easily be superseded, for it unites qualities rarely found together. The author's wide and accurate scholarship—never obtruded, but everywhere discernible—is joined to sound common sense and warm spiritual sympathy. Dr. Dods shows his sobriety of judgment in the unerring accuracy with which he sets forth the central teaching of each parable, and not less in his constant resistance of the great temptation to be carried by details into wayward and fantastic interpretations. The moral and spiritual lessons are everywhere enforced with solicitous earnestness. Nature and Life are seen to be a parable of Mercy and Judgment, and their teaching—stern, yet tender—is set forth as it came from the Lord of all worlds. They become vocal with remonstrance to those heedless of the issues bound up with this frail and fleeting term of years. Dr. Dods has, besides, the rare imaginative gift which is absolutely essential for a vital exposition of the Parables. Many passages of his book will linger in the memory: the picture of the wise virgins in their innocent sleep, dream chasing dream of the Bridegroom's coming—of our gradual entanglement in the net wherein we are drawn surely to the shore of eternity to be once more free and young—of those first in reward, as first in service, because they never thought of reward, but passed as humble a judgment on their work as the last and least of their fellow-labourers upon theirs. The writer's tone is not despondent, though very grave: "all his thoughts and words have scope." His style is almost always both strong and calm, though he perhaps occasionally falls into the pulpit use of exaggerated, or over emphatic, language.

EDITOR.

¹ Two volumes. Hodder and Stoughton. 3s. 6d. each.

Dr. Martineau's Types of Ethical Theory.¹—

This work is not confined to ethics. In the first volume the author is chiefly occupied with metaphysics and the history of philosophy. In the second volume, he expounds his own ethical system and reviews a number of English ethical theories. The work embraces a wide scope, and is marked by extensive erudition, critical skill, and analytic power. Dr. Martineau's ethical theory is a form of the intuitive. He analyses the facts of the moral consciousness. He accepts the idea of Duty and all that it implies, as it is commonly accepted by religious moralists. He is equally averse to a physical or metaphysical derivation of Morals. Accordingly, his first volume is directed to the examination and criticism of such theories, which he terms Unpsychological.

The author's leading division of ethical systems is into *Psychological* and *Unpsychological*. The latter are again subdivided into *Metaphysical* and *Physical*. "If the primary assumptions are taken from within, and you proceed by light of self-knowledge to interpret what is objective, you have a psychological system of Ethics. Invert the procedure and you have an unpsychological system. This may be of two kinds, according as you begin with assuming real, eternal, intellectual entities, and thence descend into the human world; or only phenomena and their laws. If the former, you have a metaphysical; if the latter, a physical system, of Morals."

Psychological Ethics, Dr. Martineau remarks, are *altogether* peculiar to Christendom. This he traces to the fact that, whereas the Greek genius was essentially objective, in the Christian religion, "the interest, the mystery of the world were concentrated in human nature." But the new habits of self-knowledge ripened into no systematic ethics, and the tendencies of Greek speculation have reappeared in modern philosophy, in the *physical* absolutism of Hobbes and Comte, and the *metaphysical* of Spinoza and Hegel, the *pantheistic* and *pamphysical* poles of doctrine between which philosophy still oscillates. One main cause of this, Dr. Martineau finds in the Augustinian theology. Only where the Augustinian system has not prevailed or has receded in favour of a milder theology, has the psychological tendency reasserted itself, as in this country, in Bishop Butler.

The Metaphysical systems are subdivided by the author into

¹ Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Transcendental and *Immanent*, according as the eternal ground of phenomena is regarded as greater than, or coextensive with, Nature. The doctrine of Immanency, he holds, excludes theism, while that of Transcendency leaves it still possible; "but whether the margin of being and power beyond the phenomenal universe be rightly termed God depends on something more than this mere overlapping of the scope of nature;—depends on the presence or absence there of those moral attributes which constitute a *Person*."

This view of the relation of these doctrines may, I think, be questioned. On the one side, it may be said that *personal* existence, quiescent as yet in the recesses of the Divine Will, is the *only* kind of existence which such a margin of being and power can be conceived to have. On the other side, it may be urged, that in an *infinite* Person there can exist no dormant powers, which have not found full expression and utterance in the infinitude of their manifested activity.

As a type of the Transcendental systems, Dr. Martineau selects Plato: as a type of the Immanent—Spinoza. Before proceeding to the latter he expounds the systems of Descartes and Malebranche. Lastly, under the *Physical* division of the Unpsychological theories, he treats of the system of Comte. The philosophy of each of these thinkers is reproduced with great clearness of thought and felicity of expression, and their ethical doctrines are reviewed in the light of their speculative conclusions. The examination and survey of these philosophical systems form the contents of the first volume, which is therefore, in the main, historical and critical.

The second volume deals with Psychological Ethics. The subdivisions are *Idiopsychological Ethics* and *Heteropsychological Ethics*. The method of introspection is employed in both; but, Idiopsychological Ethics seek to define "the inner facts of conscience itself": Heteropsychological theories attempt to "find the phenomena under other categories." All theories of the latter kind are "reducible to three." "The scheme of Epicurus and Bentham, which elicits the moral nature from the sentient; that of Cudworth, Clarke, and Price, which makes it a dependency on the rational; that of Shaftesbury and Hutcheson, which identifies it with the æsthetic, practically exhaust the varieties of doctrine."

Under the head of Idiopsychological Ethics, the author presents his own ethical views. He holds an intuitive perception of right

and wrong. The object of moral judgment is not the outward action but the inward spring. The phenomena of our moral life arise when two incompatible impulses appear in consciousness and contest the field. "We are sensible of a contrast between them other than that of mere intensity or of qualitative variety: . . . that one is *higher, worthier* than the other, and, in comparison with it, has the clear *right to us*." This quality is their "moral worth." "Among our springs of action then, there prevails a moral scale according to the order of excellence; and a prudential scale according to the order of strength." The former is "identical and constant for all men; the latter, variable with different persons." Dr. Martineau has constructed a table of the springs of action, arranged according to the moral scale. This list begins with the lowest, the secondary passions, and ascends through the appetites, parental and social affections, affection of compassion and other springs, to the primary sentiment of reverence which is highest on the scale. (The springs are Primary, when in the form of unreflecting instincts; Secondary, when their gratification is sought as a preconceived end.) From hence the author derives the resulting rule, "*Every action is Right, which, in presence of a lower principle, follows a higher: every action is Wrong, which, in presence of a higher principle follows a lower.*" He does not include either self-love or conscience among the springs of action. Self-love is "nothing but the abstract sum of all the likings already reckoned in the original springs themselves." Conscience is "the pervading consciousness of higher authority running through the whole scale of impulses." Various leading ethical conceptions, as Justice, Veracity, are analysed in accordance with the theory. We cannot, however, stay to consider the sufficiency of this analysis, but must press on to the estimation of the theory as a whole.

It possesses certain decided advantages over other intuitive theories. It supplies us with a general rule: *that action is right which follows the higher principle*. In the next place, it is correct in not viewing conscience or the moral law as a separate spring. We cannot wait for conscience to originate action, though it rightly claims supreme authority over the choice of different courses of action. Lastly, the theory can, better than other theories of the kind, accommodate itself to the doctrine of Evolution. It can explain the origin of the moral consciousness, by pointing to the first occasion upon which the conditions of its exercise arose.

But there are several serious, and I believe, unanswerable objections to it. We are not told *why* one spring is superior to the other, or in what its superiority consists. Again the validity of the moral scale for all men is *asserted*, but the *possibility* of this universality is not explained. Lastly, there is a third, and it appears to me, a fatal objection to it. According to the theory, the rightness of an action arises entirely from the rank or relative position of the spring from which it flows. Since it is the hierarchical superiority of the spring which makes the corresponding action right, it will follow that the superior spring ought *always* to prevail, no matter how external circumstances may change. The spring, once registered as superior, retains its superior authority, under all circumstances. No exception can arise. If there is any case, in which, the action to which an inferior spring urges, is right, and that corresponding to a superior spring wrong, their relations are for the moment reversed; the inferior is, for the time at least, superior, and the reason of the momentary superiority must be sought in objective circumstances; circumstances which render a given course of conduct right, notwithstanding the hierarchical superiority of the opposed spring. Now there is scarcely one of the superior springs which under easily conceivable circumstances ought not, on occasion, to yield to an inferior. Were the theory correct, such cases could not possibly arise. The theory is an inversion of the truth. So far from the superior spring determining the morality or rightness of the act, the rightness if not of the feeling itself (for which perhaps we are not responsible), at least of yielding to it, depends on the nature of the act, and the circumstances to which it relates.

What conceals the force of this objection, and leads us to believe that there is an *innate* and *invariable* superiority in certain springs of action over others, is, that in human nature, the so-called superior springs seldom err by *excess* though often by *defect*. Men as a rule are not inclined to be benevolent or grateful overmuch. But there is no theoretic objection to assuming that men may be, and some men in actual fact are, influenced by feelings of benevolence or gratitude, not only in excess of what the occasion demands, but also in cases where there exists no real claim to their benevolence or gratitude. Here certainly they ought to follow the inferior principle of self-interest. Benevolence to the unworthy is positively wrong, and a good-natured or benevolent fool, is sometimes pitied, but more often despised. Dr. Martineau's

theory is too subjective. The theory which derives moral obligation from a hierarchical superiority in the *objects* of human activity—self, family, state, church, is more plausible.

But while dissenting, for the reasons given, from the theory contained in it, this is by no means the least valuable part of Dr. Martineau's work. His examination of the springs of action abounds with reflections, in which acute psychological observation and great practical wisdom are combined. Few who are engaged in the instruction or guidance of others, but may derive from it valuable practical hints.

The chapters on Heteropsychological theories contain a penetrating criticism of the ethics of Hedonism and Evolution. Dr. Martineau's criticisms are always keen and just. The work concludes with an exposition and critical survey of the systems of Cudworth, Clarke, Price, Shaftesbury and Hutcheson. The task is ably performed, and is in every way worthy of the eminent author.

Queen's College, Cork.

GEORGE J. STOKES.

On Gen. iii. 5 (comp. ii. 9; iii. 22).—An attractive explanation of the phrase "knowing good and evil," is mentioned by Riehm, and assigned by him to the authorship of the great Hebrew scholar, Hupfeld (review of Budde's *Die bibl. Urgeschichte* in *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1885, p. 764). In Gen. iii. 5 the serpent is the speaker; he flatters the woman with the prospect of "becoming as gods, knowing good and evil." This is merely, it would seem, according to Hupfeld, a periphrasis for "everything"; remember how the Sirens try to tempt Odysseus by promising to satisfy his curiosity out of their boundless knowledge (*Od.*, xii. 188). That "good and evil" is a Hebrew idiom for "everything," is shown by Gen. xxiv. 50; xxxi. 24; 2 Sam. xiv. 17, comp. 20. A parallel idiom is "small or great," Num. xxii. 18, comp. 38; and precisely the same idiom occurs in Homeric Greek (*Od.*, xviii. 229). Hupfeld thinks, however, that in the name of the tree, as well as in the Divine words in iii. 22, "good and evil" has an ethical meaning. The serpent in fact cheated the woman by giving a new though a possible sense to the name of the tree. "As gods, knowing everything," is, perhaps, a more probable interpretation of the words in iii. 5, than "as gods, acquainted with the distinctions of morality."

T. K. CHEYNE.

On Ps. xlix. 7.—The Revised Version renders as the Authorized:—

“None (of them) can by any means redeem his brother,
Nor give to God a ransom for him.”

This rendering however inserts one word which is not in the original (“his” before “brother”), and does not take notice of the unusual position of the object or accusative (*i.e.* that the clause begins not with עֲשֵׂה, but with הָיָה). We surely want such a word as “even” prefixed to “(his) brother.” So much for the translation. It ought however to be added that there is a strong exegetical argument against accepting this as the psalmist’s meaning. The context suggests that the idea in the mind of the writer is that the irreligious rich man will not be able at the last to save himself from the grasp of death. Ewald would therefore take הָיָה to be an error of the ear (both the ear and the eye bring fertile sources of false readings) for הָיָה, and render, “Nevertheless none can set himself free,” corresponding to “Nevertheless God shall set free my soul,” in v. 15. If we keep the usual reading, we must say with Riehm that the nothingness of money is illustrated by the fact that, just as Dives can do no real harm to those he oppresses (see v. 5), so he can do no real good to those whom he would fain befriend. Some may think that הָיָה may possibly be an allusion to a dirge in which the mourner declares that he would redeem his deceased friend, if he only could. Wetzstein (in Delitzsch’s *Iob*, ed. 2, p. 463), refers to a Syrian dirge with the phrase *bi-abî*, *i.e.* I would give my father for thee. Elsewhere he quotes two verses of another Syrian dirge, probably embodying primitive ideas:—

“Ah! if he could be ransomed! Truly I would pay the ransom!
Redeem me, O my dear kinsfolk, with steeds of noble limbs.

“Ah! if he could be ransomed! Truly, I would pay the ransom!
Redeem me, O dear brethren of mine, with pure virgins.”

In later Jewish theology it was held that the living could “redeem the dead” (the same word is used as in the psalm, פִּדְיוֹן) by almsgiving (Weber, *Altsynagogale Theologie*, p. 315). In a different context these illustrations would almost settle the meaning.

T. K. CHEYNE.

SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

(Continued from p. 380.)

HAVING once entered on the description of the apostolic ministry, Paul pours forth his thoughts and feelings in one broad rapid stream. While by the power of life and death attached to that ministry, the servant of Christ is raised above the ignoble artifices of the teachers of legalism, the *glorious hopes* which it inspires sustain the Apostle himself in the midst of all his spiritual toil and travail, and make him triumph over all the discouragements which otherwise might overwhelm him. Everywhere he bears about with him the crucifixion of Christ, but everywhere also he has ~~part in His resurrection~~; and if, in the end, the body is worn out in the strife and strain, he knows that God has prepared for him another habitation eternal in the heavens, in which he will soon enjoy perfect fellowship with Him (chap. iv. 7-v. 10).

With a heart thus raised above all low and petty motives, the Apostle sets himself to the task assigned to him. The baneful spirit of self-seeking has been cast out of him as out of all those who truly experience the redemption wrought out for them by Christ. Christ died for all; in Him then every believer is dead, as a natural man. There is in Christ only a company of risen men with whom the old earthly relations have passed away and all is become new. Even Christ Himself exists for them no more as an earthly, national, Jewish Christ, but only as the spiritual, heavenly Christ, in whom all old distinctions are done away, and He alone remains as the centre of a new creation. Marvellous indeed is the work wrought out by Him. God was in Christ first reconciling the world unto Himself and then by His ambassadors, the apostles, inviting every man to come to Him who had borne the sins of all, that they might be

made the righteousness of God in Him. So sublime a task absorbs the whole soul of him to whom it is entrusted and leaves no place for the satisfaction or glorification of self (chap. v. 10-21).

What remains therefore for the Apostle is to raise his conduct to the level of so high a calling. And this is what he has striven to do, as he shows in chapter vi., where he reminds the Church of what he has done for it since its foundation; what sufferings he has borne for its sake, and what Divine strength has upborne him through such a diversity of trial. Unhappily, he does not always find in the Church, especially at Corinth, such faithful affection as he had deserved from them. The more his heart is enlarged, the more theirs seems straitened towards him. Why is this? Because he is obliged to ask of them the sacrifices which fidelity to their Christian profession demands? St. Paul is probably thinking here of what he had said to them before (1 Cor. viii.-x.), as to the necessity of entirely giving up the feasts offered to idols in the heathen temples. This injunction seems to have most irritated the Corinthians who thought themselves strong, and who were wont to say, "All things are lawful for me." The various interpreters who have thought that the passage from chapter vi. 2-vii. 1, of this Epistle ought to be omitted, have so judged because they have failed to perceive this reference.

After affirming in the opening of chapter vii. that he has done nothing which should relax the bond of affection between them and him, Paul turns in ver. 4 to the joy that filled his heart on the recent arrival of Titus, whom he had met in Macedonia (4, 5). This forms a new starting point. So far he has been tracing things in order. This coming of Titus forms the goal. Paul had explained his return to Ephesus without staying at Corinth, then he had described his departure for Macedonia and waiting at Troas, then his meeting with Titus. The Apostle describes with

effusion the joy with which his heart is now filled at hearing the good news brought by Titus. In order to give the Corinthians some idea of its intensity, he dwells on the sorrow that he had felt after sending off his former stern letter of rebuke. But now how keen is his thankfulness, as he hears how they have avenged his wounded honour. Henceforth he knows that he may fully rely upon them.

This forms the transition to the second part of the Epistle, in which he urges them to press on with the important work of the collection.

Macedonia has already done its share, while so far it appears the Corinthians had done nothing. He has therefore decided to send Titus to them with two deputies from the Churches of Macedonia, and he is the bearer of this letter. Paul did not wish to make this collection burdensome to them, but on the other hand he was sure that a rich blessing would come from it to themselves and the whole Church (chap. viii., ix.). The Apostle speaks of one of the two deputies who accompanied Titus as a man whose gifts as an evangelist had made him famous through all the Churches of Macedonia. It seems probable, as several of the Fathers thought, that this messenger may have been St. Luke, who had remained with the Church at Philippi after the departure of Paul, Silas and Timotheus. It is possible that the other may have been Aristarchus, the Macedonian, who afterwards with Luke travelled with St. Paul to Rome.

Having thus reached the time present in this second part of his letter, Paul now turns his eyes to the *future*. The immediate future is his proposed visit to Corinth. It is natural that all his thoughts should be fixed on this goal of his desires, and he frankly sets forth his feelings in the third part of the Epistle (chap. x.-xiii.).

This clearly begins a fresh division, and Paul introduces it with the unusual formula: "*Now I Paul myself.*"

There is also a marked change of tone in the verses which follow. From affectionate tenderness he passes to the severest irony. The abruptness of the change is surprising. How could Paul utter such cutting rebukes after just assuring the Church of the joyful satisfaction he felt in its conduct (chap. vii.)? Some have gone so far as to suppose that these last four chapters are the very severe letter¹ previously sent by Titus to which the Apostle had referred in chapter vii., and that it has thus come down to us tacked on to the end of the later letter. But it is impossible that this second Epistle should have abruptly terminated with chapter ix.; and we should be driven to suppose that some one had carefully expunged the end of the genuine letter to affix to it another letter of quite a different tone. There is no ground for such far-fetched hypotheses. We see at once from chapter x. 2, where Paul speaks of "some which count of us as if we walked according to the flesh," that though he seems to be addressing the whole Church, he is really speaking here only to the disaffected party, and to the Church in so far as it had allowed itself to be influenced by it. The majority of the Church has returned, no doubt, to a better mind; but there is still a rebellious minority, whose opposition must be broken down, either by means of this letter or by energetic action when Paul comes. "Being in readiness to avenge all disobedience," he says, "when your obedience shall be fulfilled." There are these two things to be done: to secure on the part of the faithful a still more complete submission, and on the part of the recalcitrant a full surrender. This is the drift of these four chapters, which thus connect themselves quite naturally with the foregoing.

The Apostle implores them not to force him to use, when he comes, the apostolic power which Christ has given him. Doubtless there are among them those who

¹ Hausrath, *Der Vier-Capitel Brief*.

do not believe that he has any such power, and who accuse him of being weighty and strong only while he is at a distance, but in presence weak and contemptible. He argues, however, that he has given in his ministry irrefutable proof of his spiritual power. Was he not the founder of this very Church of Corinth, into which these his adversaries have obtruded themselves, entering into other men's labours? "Not he that commendeth himself (by vaunting words) is approved, but whom the Lord commendeth," sealing his work by signs following.

Since his enemies disparage him, he is fain to defend himself, from very love to the Church, and in order to keep intact the spiritual bond by which he has bound them to Christ.

Does he not see them turning aside from the doctrine he taught them, and receiving with open arms any who come preaching another Jesus and a different Spirit? Yet, he asks, in what was he behind these new apostles for whom they set him aside? There is only one thing in which they outdo him; they take pay for their preaching, and get themselves maintained by the Church. In this respect alone will he own his inferiority to these false apostles, who, like Satan, can clothe themselves as angels of light. Well then, since they force him to it, and though it would be folly under any other circumstances, he will reveal to them the secrets of his soul's travail, and of his inmost life. And here the Apostle describes, with an incomparably graphic touch, all the privations which he has endured for Christ. He could, indeed, go on to tell them of more glorious things. The great city of Damascus was one day stirred to a frenzy about him, and sought to kill him. Then he had visions and raptures of revelation, in which he was caught up to the very third heavens. But to speak of these things is folly. If he must speak, let it rather be of the infirmities which humble him, and are, therefore, his

safeguard. Such is that thorn in the flesh which he carries about with him, and about which the Lord said to him, "My grace is sufficient for thee." If he must glory, let him glory in those things which keep him weak, for then is he strong (chap. xi. 1-xii. 11).

From this picture, which he has felt constrained to draw in self-defence, he turns again to his adversaries, and to those members of the Church who had let themselves be carried away by them.

As there is only one point on which he has not made good his apostleship among them, namely, by receiving nothing at their hands, he will adhere to the same course of conduct when he comes again. Some had dared to say that this was only a pretence, and that he knew well enough how to get money for himself through his agents. Let them prove, then, that one of those whom he had sent had acted in this respect differently from himself. Those who bring this charge against him will do well to take heed and examine themselves, lest, after having been warned, the Apostle finds them when he comes, just as before, and is obliged to deal sharply with them, according to the authority the Lord has given him. He would rather show himself gentle and weak among them. Let them not force him to come with a rod; for if he can do nothing *against* the truth, he can do something *for* it. But his desire is, that in this coming visit all the weakness should be on his part, and all the strength on theirs (chap. xii. 11-xiii. 10).

The Apostle concludes with a short exhortation to joy, unity, peace; and with a blessing in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, which, as an apostle of Jesus Christ, he substitutes for the old priestly benedictions. It was not then without reason that Paul commenced this section with the words, "I Paul myself." This part of the letter has been taken up with purely per-

sonal matters, but not by his own choice; the necessity was laid upon him.

It is natural to ask, Who were then these bitter enemies of Paul, who came to exert such an important and disastrous influence upon the Church of Corinth? They were evidently emissaries from without, for they had brought with them letters of commendation (chap. iii. 1). On their arrival they had taken advantage of the disunion which had already crept into the Church. Seeing that the more faithful disciples of Paul were treated with scant respect by those who were taken up with Apollos, and that these again were slighted by those who boasted of belonging to Peter's party, they took occasion to commend themselves as the only ones who really came in the name of Christ. What ground could they have for arrogating to themselves such a distinction? Baur and his school suppose that they took this title because they were sent by the apostles of Christ, and especially by James, the Lord's brother. Those whom Paul calls in this letter "*the very chiefest apostles*," must, then, be the Twelve, and it is from them that these Jewish emissaries must have received the "letters of commendation" mentioned in this Epistle. Pursuing this track, the famous leader of the Tübingen school has come to the conclusion, that in the early Church, Paul and the Twelve lived and worked in a spirit of mutual antagonism.

But it is easy to see the falsity of this idea. The Twelve after having given the hand of fellowship to St. Paul, as he himself tells us (Gal. ii.), could not send out messengers from the Churches of Palestine, fortified with letters of commendation from them, to hinder Paul's work among the Gentiles.

Moreover, these men who claimed to be specially "of Christ," did not set themselves to oppose the followers of Paul and of Apollos alone, but of Peter also (1 Cor. i. 12).

Lastly, it is quite evident from 2 Cor. xi. 5, 6, that those whom the Church of Corinth seriously, and Paul ironically, called "the very chiefest apostles," were personages distinguished in some degree by their culture and eloquence; for Paul says: "I reckon that I am not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles; since though I am rude (*ιδιότης*) in speech, I am not in knowledge." These men were then exalted above Paul for their gifts of speech, just as Apollos had already been preferred to him on the same ground. How could this apply to the Twelve, who are themselves characterised as "unlearned and ignorant men" (*ἀγράμματοι καὶ ἰδιῶτα*, Acts iv. 13), and who were certainly far inferior to Paul in eloquence? The Apostle gives us to understand also that he had come behind these men in this respect; that he had not (like them) made himself burdensome to the Church (xi. 7; xii. 2). Now there can be no doubt that he is speaking of the Church of Corinth (xi. 20) when he describes the ill-advised conduct of these intruders in her midst. But the Twelve had never been at Corinth. It is not then the apostles at Jerusalem, but these new comers themselves whom Paul thus ironically describes, in language borrowed from their ardent partisans. In thus describing them, he stigmatises them as placing themselves not only above him, Paul, but also above those who in the ordinary language of the Church were called apostles, and especially above Peter. Some critics even of the Tübingen school have clearly seen that it was impossible to regard these adversaries of Paul as directly sent by the Twelve; and they have ventured on the conjecture that they were rather men who had personally known Christ at Jerusalem, perhaps some of His kindred or acquaintance, who, going about to preach Him in the synagogues, had come as far as Corinth. We know, indeed, from 1 Cor. ix. 5, that the brethren of the Lord did go about as missionary evangelists. But we have no authority

for attributing to them feelings of hostility to Paul, nor views differing from those of the Twelve.

The account which Paul gives of the Conference at Jerusalem (Gal. ii.) excludes, as is now fully recognised, any idea of hostility to the work of Paul among the Gentiles, on the part of James the Lord's brother. He, too, had at that Conference recognised Paul as a divinely called apostle, no less than Peter, and had given him the right hand of fellowship. Hence we conclude that these strange missionaries, who had formed a hostile party to Paul at Corinth, designating itself as "of Christ," came no doubt from Palestine, and probably from Jerusalem. but that like "the false brethren privily brought in," of whom Paul speaks (Gal. ii. 4), they did not belong to the Twelve, but acted independently of them, and even presumed to set themselves above them. They were probably of the number of those "priests" and "Pharisees" whom Luke mentions (Acts vi. 7; xv. 5) as having acknowledged Jesus as their Messiah. Having once entered the Church, these members of the Jewish aristocracy had hoped to take the direction of affairs into their own hands. They despised the apostles, as unlearned and ignorant men, and thought that they should shape as they pleased the work of Christian missions, the importance of which they recognised as a feature of the Messianic kingdom. They hoped, as we have seen in studying the Epistle to the Galatians, to make use of the conquering power of the Gospel as a means of extending the kingdom of the law in the Gentile world. Animated with this spirit, more legal than Christian, they set aside the apostles, and endeavoured to divert to their own ends the labours of Paul.

This, if we mistake not, was the party whose emissaries came to Corinth, furnished with letters of commendation. Since the conflicts in Antioch and Galatia however, they had changed their tactics. They no longer spoke of cir-

cumcision, which would at once have repelled the Greeks, but they falsified even more thoroughly the spirit of the Gospel. Paul accuses them of preaching *another Jesus*, of introducing *another Spirit* and *another Gospel*. They are the tools of the serpent who beguiled Eve (chap. xi. 1-4). It is obviously at them that, in closing his first Epistle, Paul abruptly flings the challenge: "If any man love not the Lord, let him be anathema." This is all of which we can be sure. We do not know what was this new Jesus, this new Gospel, this new Spirit which they brought in. It would seem that it was something more than a doctrine in which legal elements were blended. The term, "*another Jesus*," suggests some new and dangerous theory of Christology, and I am disposed to think that it was at these neologists Paul aimed the vigorous arguments against human wisdom which we find in the first four chapters of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and which have often been erroneously thought to apply to Apollos. However this may be, the Judæo-Christian character of these people is put beyond question by the passage 2 Cor. xi. 22, 23. It would appear, moreover, that they had not scrupled to ally themselves at Corinth with men of licentious life (chap. xii. 20, 21). All means seemed to them legitimate that would help to overturn the work of Paul.

We see now how wisely Paul proceeds in dealing with this deadly error. He first tries to strengthen all the links which unite him to the better part of the Church. Then, when he feels that the majority has once more rallied firmly in defence of his person and his apostleship, he attacks with all the energy of which he is capable, the rebellious party with its strange leaders, and sets before them his ultimatum.

What did these men do whom Paul had so menaced and stigmatised? Did they await his arrival? Did they resolve to hold out against him? We doubt it. Either

they left the place of their own accord, in consequence of this letter, or the Church made them go. Touched with the tenderness of those words: "I determined this for myself, that I would not come again to you with sorrow; for if I make you sorry, who then is he who maketh me glad but he that is made sorry by me?" it hastened to banish all the obnoxious elements that might have called for the stern exercise of the apostolic authority. The three months which Paul spent at Corinth during the winter of the years 58-59, were months of peace. Of this we have the proof in our hands. The Epistle to the Romans was the fruit of this repose.

In this Second Epistle to the Corinthians we get the fullest insight into the heart of the Apostle, so full of tenderness, human and Divine. From it we learn what were his views of apostleship, and of the Christian ministry generally. Nothing finer has been written on this subject than the passages in which it is treated in this letter. And if in the Epistle to the Romans we find the fullest statement of the Gospel, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians the most complete chapter of Church discipline, we have in this Second Epistle to the Corinthians the very mind of God with regard to the institution of the Christian ministry.

F. GODET.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

A CRITICAL ESTIMATE.

FIFTH PAPER.

WE hold that the Revisers were bound to make some sense of every passage in the books before them. We do not intend this for satire. We admit that Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Psalms, and other O. T. Scriptures contain passages which

one may study for weeks without being convinced one has hit the author's meaning. But surely the translator should relegate his admission of the obscurity to a note. The text must show that he has endorsed (however doubtingly) some one of the diverse interpretations, and has expressed his attestation in intelligible English. Anything rather than vagueness. Is not this the accepted rule for all translation-work? It may of course be argued that a vague rendering is the true reproduction of what seems to us a vague passage. But we think a very little reflection saps the force of this reasoning. At any rate, where—as in the R.V.—an apparatus of marginal notes qualifies the text, the translator can sufficiently ease the strain on his conscience. An asterisk or other symbol might have been used by the Revisers to indicate, where necessary, the sad confession—“we give preference to this interpretation, but the passage is hopelessly obscure.” Scholars translate a Greek chorus, in the face of similar difficulties, without any such contrivance for expressing “proviso and exception.” The decision in hard passages is of course the best test of a translator's capacity. “Where no oxen are, the crib is clean;” and where obscurities are reproduced word-for-word, criticism is to some extent evaded. Nevertheless, in the passages we now tabulate we hold that the O. T. Company has simply shirked its responsibilities.

Prov. xxi. 4, “An high look and a proud heart, [even] *the lamp* of the wicked is sin.” What does this mean? Possibly the flashiness which wicked persons of the ἀλάζων type affect in demeanour, dress, and manner of living; the “desire that's *glorious*” which Imogen terms “most miserable.” If so, we must paraphrase, “Yea, all the *showy splendour* of the wicked is sin.” But it seems best to take לָנֶפֶשׁ here and elsewhere in Proverbs, in the sense “line of offspring,” according to a common Oriental figure (see e.g. Ps. cxxxii. 17). Thus in Prov. xiii. 9, “the lamp of the

wicked shall be put out," means his line shall be extinct. To this interpretation we adapt the first clause of the verse, and render freely, "Haughty and proud that they are, the offspring of the wicked are full of sin."

Prov. xxi. 28, "A false witness shall perish, but *the man that heareth* shall speak unchallenged." Heareth God? Or heareth what he afterwards attests? It is difficult to decide which. But the R. V. should endorse the one or the other decisively. In the one case we must paraphrase—"the man that hearkens to God's commandments;" in the other—"the man that attests only what he hears." "Unchallenged," by the way, is an improvement on "constantly" of A. V.

Prov. xxvii. 16. Apropos of the contentious woman, we have, "He that would restrain her restraineth the wind, *and his right hand encountereth oil.*" Utterly unintelligible to the English reader. We hold the Heb. expresses two comparisons. It is as hopeless as bottling the wind (צָפַן = "stow away," rather than "restrain"—though like our vernacular "shut up," it gets the latter as a secondary meaning). And it is as hopeless as trying to carry away oil in the hand. We must render freely, "and he is as one who would grasp oil with his right hand." Eccl.

vi. 10, "*Whatsoever hath been, the name thereof was given long ago*, and it is known that it is man, neither can he contend with him that is mightier than he." Obscure, if not inaccurate? We think the Preacher is here pressing his characteristic belief in Divine predestination. Rend., "Whosoever is in being, long ago was his name given and he known, for he is but mortal man, and he cannot contend with Him that is mightier than he." אשר, "which," is used repeatedly in Ecclesiastes in the sense "for," "seeing that"—an application quite grammatical, though the English is somewhat peculiar. Eccl.

vii. 28 again illustrates this anomalous use of אשר. R. V., gives (28), "Behold this have I found . . . (28) Which

my soul still seeketh, but I have not found; one man among a thousand have I found, but a woman among all those have I not found." How could the Preacher have found what he had not found? We hold that v. 28 is quasi-parenthetical. What he *had* found is not expressed till v. 29, *scil.* that God had made men upright, but they had sought out many inventions. To clear the way and lead up to the climax, he details in v. 28 what he *had not* found, *viz.* much goodness in men or any in women. It is hardly necessary to mark v. 28 in a parenthesis; but we must of course render, "*Here is what* my soul seeketh," not "*which.*"

Ps. xxxvi. 1, "*The transgression of the wicked saith within my heart*, There is no fear of God before his eyes." The v. is notoriously difficult. We prefer ourselves to read לבו, "his heart," for לבי, "my heart," and render "Transgression speaks as an oracle to the wicked in his inner heart." But what does the R. V. mean? How can the wicked's transgression say anything within the good man's heart? Does it mean the sight of his transgression makes the good man say what follows? We want a paraphrase.

Ps. xl. 15, "Let them be desolate¹ [Ps. lxx. 3, "Let them be turned¹ back"] *by reason of their shame.*" Both verses lose their force when thus rendered. The A. V. "*For a reward of their shame,*" is better, though the force of the construction is missed in this rendering. עקב undoubtedly can mean a result as well as a cause. We render, "*For a reward tending to their shame.*"

Ps. lxxiii. 10, "*Therefore his people return hither*; and waters of a full cup are wrung out to them." What the Revisers mean we know not. We believe the first clause refers, like the second, to the multitude of adherents secured by the ungodly men previously described. Rend., "*Therefore their people turn after them.*" Or if this be not intelligible, we

¹ In the one Psalm it is יִשְׁמּוּ, in the other יִשְׁבּוּ. It cannot be doubted that one of these readings is a corruption due to itacism.

must paraphrase, "*Therefore it is their adherents are turned aside after them.*"

Ps. lxxvii. 10, "And I said, *This is my infirmity, [But I will remember] the years of the right hand of the Most High.*" In our own Commentary we did not consider this interpretation worthy of notice, despite its respectable Rabbinic parentage. We believe few modern critics of any note endorse it. If accepted, we want a paraphrase to give a lucid sense. The rendering we prefer is, "*This is my consolation—the past years of the might of the Most High,*" i.e. God's mighty works in years past.

Ps. cxxvii. 2, "It is vain for you that ye rise up early, and so late take rest . . . [*for*] *so he giveth unto his beloved sleep.*" What do these words mean? We render, "*just as much will He give to His beloved by a sleep.*" The Psalm is entitled, "to Solomon," and the v. refers perhaps to Solomon's dream (1 Kings iii. 5 seq.), in which he was endowed with wisdom, riches, honour, etc.

Ezek. xxi. 25, "Prince of Israel whose day is come, *in the time of the iniquity of the end.*" Here we take a different view of נֶפֶשׁ, which may mean the penalty of sin as well as the sin itself. Rend., "*In the day of final punishment.*"

Hab. ii. 5, "Yea, moreover *wine is a treacherous dealer, a haughty man, and that keepeth not at home.*" This is sheer nonsense. The passage is difficult; but most scholars are agreed that the intemperance, arrogance, and greed of the Chaldean invader are alluded to. We render, "*And besides that wine beguiles him, he is a braggart, who will not keep quiet.*"

Mic. vi. 9, "The voice of the LORD crieth unto the city, *and the man of wisdom will see thy name; hear ye the rod,* and who hath appointed it." The "name" of God appeals to our ears rather than our sight, and a "rod" to our backs rather than our ears. There is a Persian idiom to "see a smell," which is suggested by this meaningless literalism, "see thy name." We are also reminded of the mawkish bathos of the hymn

lines, "For very love beholding Thy happy name they weep." But surely the true reading here is not *see*, but *fear*, as LXX., Targum, Syriac, Jerome. "*Truly wise are they that fear Thy name*" will express this part of the verse. As for "hear ye the rod," we must of course paraphrase "*hear ye the destined penalty.*"

II. We venture to differ from the O.T. company in regard to the treatment of certain well-known Hebrew words. Much might be said here concerning English terms familiar to us from infancy in connexion with Scripture history, but really inadequate as translations. For instance, every child learns of Noah's "*ark*," and of an "*ark*" in the Temple, and of course thinks that there was some kind of likeness between the two; possibly many adult readers imagine that the same Hebrew word is used for both. In the one case the word is תבה, recurring only as a designation of the coracle in which the infant Moses was exposed (Exod. ii. 3). In the other it is ארון, which indicates Joseph's "coffin" in Gen. l. 26, and the offertory box of Jehoiada the priest in 2 Kings xii. 9. The only reason why we have the one word "*ark*" for these two terms is that the LXX. unfortunately gives κιβωτός both for Noah's house-punt and for the sacred coffer of the Tabernacle. Hence Vulgate *arca*. Luther so far distinguishes between the two as to give *Kasten* for the one and *Lade* for the other. Under the restrictions to which they had submitted, it was perhaps impossible for the Revisers to differentiate. Then again, there is the word "*mercy-seat*." The Revisers will probably agree with us that this rendering of כפרת is based on a mistake. The word simply means the "lid" or "cover" of the sacred Ark. At the ends of this lid were the golden cherubim, and over it dwelt the Divine Presence. Hence it was "*the lid*" *par excellence*, the "*sacred cover*." But when we render "*mercy-seat*" we endorse the false etymology of the LXX.,

which explaining the word by נִפְּר, "to expiate," gives ἱλαστήριον, whence Vulg. "propitiatorium." Here, again, doubtless the Revisers' hands were tied. But we may reasonably demur to their retention in the Prophets of the term "burden," e.g. in Isa. xiii. 1, "The burden of Damascus which Isaiah . . . did see." Surely מִשָּׁא = the "oracle" or "utterance" which the Prophet is charged to "take up" (נָשָׂא). Again, the common word חֶסֶד = "kindness," or "goodness," rather than "mercy," albeit the LXX. renders it by ἔλεος. This emendation would effect an improvement in many passages. We hold that כִּי (usually "for" or "because") is sometimes hypothetical, and = "put the case that," even when the past verb follows, cf. Ezek. iii. 19. Thus in Ps. xxvii. 10 we see no need to render "For my father and my mother have forsaken me, but," etc. We would give "Should my father . . . then the LORD will take me up." And in Ps. lv. 18 we render "He hath redeemed my soul . . . from the battle, albeit [not for, as A.V.] they were many that strove with me." We hold that רִקָּה means the "cheeks" as well as the "temples." It is surely the cheeks of the bride that are likened in Song iv. 3, vi. 7, to a sliced pomegranate, a comparison used as we should use that of a cherry. Fancy likening a fair lady's temples to a cherry. The verb עָנָה like ἀπεκρίθη in the N.T. sometimes means to take up one's own discourse, to "announce" rather than to "answer," as e.g. in Job iii. 1. In Isa. xxi. 9 the R.V. by retaining "and he answered and said," makes it doubtful who is the speaker.

III. Other phrases might be noticed under this heading. But our critical estimate would be imperfect indeed if we failed to notice the many substantial improvements on the A.V. The gist of these five papers has been that we desire more. The treatment of both text and translation in the R. V. is far behind the scholarship of the day. The work might

have been produced by some respectable Hebraist a hundred years ago. We move, as we read it, in the age of Bp. Lowth and Michaelis rather than of Ewald and Delitzsch. Yet even so, we are ahead of King James' translators, and the mercies for which we express our gratitude are not small. We tabulate some of the more striking emendations not yet noticed, and give references at the close of this Paper to others equally unassailable. Will common sense import these from the R.V. to the pulpit, if not to the reading-desk? Will our clergy feel that they are failing in a moral duty when, in professed reverence for King James' translation, they preach the Bible otherwise than as it was written? We fear that as usual ignorance and indolence will seek palliation under the title of religious conservatism, and the faulty principles, blemishes of style, etc., patent in the R.V., will be made a pretext for a policy of clerical indifferentism. Is it too late to say that if it be wrong to regard these Scriptures as the "Word of God" in the good old Puritanical sense, it is worse to disparage them by ending our critical study with that distant "bowing acquaintance" which is sufficient to satisfy a Bishop's Examiner? We have resented Convocation's interference with the Revisers. But nothing could be more desirable than that the Church's representatives should in some way intervene to turn the attention of our weekly preachers to the unassailable emendations of the R.V.,—emendations long accepted by all scholars, and usually set in defiance in our pulpits. Might not the Bishops issue a paper of references to texts which have been undeniably set right in the Revised Bible? The clergy might be requested, if they have no leisure for the critical study of the Scriptures, at least to use none of such texts in preaching and teaching without referring to the emendation in the R.V. The paper might also be exhibited in every Sunday school, and circulated as a companion to the R.V. among our Bible-reading laity.

The following translations at least are incontrovertible, and they are but the ἀκροθίβια of what the R.V. has won for us.

Gen. xxvii. 40—Isaac blessing Esau says, “When thou shalt *break loose* [A.V. “have the dominion”] thou shalt shake his yoke from off thy neck.” Gen. xxx. 11—“And Leah said *Fortunate* [A.V. “A troop cometh”], and she called his name Gad.” The quaint A.V. rendering was perhaps inspired by the patriarch’s prediction in Gen. xlix. 19. But the latter passage really only plays on Gad’s name, and does not interpret it. גַּד here exactly = *à la bonne heure*. Gen. xlix. 6—of Simeon and Levi: “And in their self-will they *houghed an ox*.” A.V. “digged down a wall.” Deut. xxxii. 5—“They have dealt corruptly with him, [*they are*] *not his children* [*it is*] *their blemish*.” A.V. “their spot is not [the spot] of his children.” Judg. v. 14—“And out of Zebulun they that *handle the marshal’s staff*.” A.V. “handle the pen of the writer.” Judg. v. 21—“O my soul *march on with strength*.” A.V. “thou hast trodden down strength.” 1 Sam. xiv. 41—“Therefore Saul said unto the LORD the God of Israel, *Show the right*.” A.V. “Give a perfect [lot].” Job v. 24—“And thou shalt visit thy fold and shalt *miss nothing*.” A.V. “And thou shalt visit thy habitation and shalt not sin.” Job vii. 20—“*If I have sinned, what do I unto thee, O thou watcher of men?*” A.V. “I have sinned; what shall I do unto thee, O thou preserver of men?” Job ix. 22—“*It is all one*; therefore I say, He destroyeth the perfect and the wicked” A.V. “This is one thing, therefore, etc.” Job xi. 6—“Oh, . . . that He would shew thee the secrets of wisdom, *that it is manifold in effectual working*.” A.V. “that they are double to that which is.” Job xii. 5—“*In the thought of him that is at ease there is contempt for misfortune: It is ready for them whose foot slippeth*.” A.V. “He that is ready to slip with [his] feet is [as a] lamp

despised in the thought of him who is at ease." Job xvii. 6—"He hath made me also a byword of the people, *and I am become an open abhorring*" A.V. "And aforetime I was as a tabret." Job xxii. 30—"He shall deliver [even] him that is *not* innocent:" A.V. "He shall deliver the island of the innocent." Job xxviii. 4—"He breaketh open a shaft away from where men sojourn, They are forgotten of the foot [that passeth by], they hang afar from men, they swing to and fro." This is an interesting account of ancient mining operations. It was spoilt in the A.V. "The flood breaketh out from the inhabitant; [even the waters] forgotten of the foot: they are dried up, they are gone away from men." Ps. vii. 13—"He maketh his arrows *fiery* [shafts]:" A.V. "He ordaineth his arrows against the persecutors." Ps. x. 4—"The wicked in the pride of his countenance [saith], *He will not require it:*" A.V. "The wicked through the pride of his countenance will not seek after God." Ps. xxix. 10—"The LORD *sat* [as king] at the Flood:" A.V. "The LORD sitteth upon the flood." Ps. xcv. 4—"The *heights of the mountains are* his also:" A.V. "The strength of the hills is his also." Ps. cxix. 160—"The *sum of thy word is truth:*" A.V. "Thy word is true from the beginning." Prov. x. 23—"It is as sport to a fool to do wickedness; *and* [so is] *wisdom to a man of understanding:*" A.V. "But a man of understanding hath wisdom." Prov. xii. 27—"But the *precious substance of men* [is to] the diligent:" A.V. "But the substance of a diligent man is precious." Prov. xxvi. 8—"As a bag of gems in a heap of stones, so is he that giveth honour to a fool:" A.V. "As he that bindeth a stone in a sling, so etc." Prov. xxix. 10—"The bloodthirsty hate him that is perfect: *and as for the upright they seek his life:*" A.V. "The bloodthirsty hate the upright: but the just seek his soul." Eccl. ii. 8—"I gat me men singers and women singers, and the delights of the sons of men, *concubines very many:*" A.V. "[as]

musical instruments and that of all sorts." Eccl. iii. 21—"Who knoweth the spirit of man, *whether it* [A.V. "that"] goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast *whether it* [A.V. "that"] goeth downward to the earth." Eccl. x. 11—"If the serpent bite before it be charmed, then there is no advantage in the charmer:" A.V. "Surely the serpent will bite without enchantment; and a babbler is no better." Isa. xxiv. 15—"Wherefore glorify ye the LORD *in the east*:" A.V. "in the fires." Isa. liii. 3—"And as one from whom men hide their faces he was despised:" A.V. "And we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised." Isa. lvii. 19—"Thou didst find a *quickenings of thy strength*:" A.V. "Thou hast found the life of thine hand." Jer. ix. 26—"The children of Ammon and Moab, *and all that have the corners [of their hair] polled*:" A.V. "And all [that are] in the utmost corners." Jer. li. 59—"Now Seraiah was *chief chamberlain*:" A.V. "was a quiet prince." Lam. i. 7—"The adversaries saw her, they did mock at her desolations:" A.V. "at her sabbaths." Lam. ii. 20—"Children that are dandled in arms:" A.V. "Children of a span long." Dan. iii. 25—"Lo, I see four men loose . . . and the aspect of the fourth is like a son of the gods:" A.V. "and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God." Hos. iv. 18—"Her rulers dearly love shame:" A.V. "Her rulers with shame do love, Give ye." Hos. vi. 7—"But they like Adam have transgressed the covenant:" A.V. "But they like men, etc." Hos. x. 1—"Israel is a luxuriant vine, which putteth forth his fruit:" A.V. "Israel is an empty vine, he bringeth forth fruit unto himself." Hos. x. 11—"I will set a rider on Ephraim." A.V. "I will make Ephraim to ride." Hos. xiii. 10, 14—"Where now is thy king? . . . O death, where are thy plagues?" A.V. "I will be thy king . . . O death, I will be thy plagues." Hos. xiv. 2—"So will we render as bullocks [the offering of] our lips:"

A.V. "So will we render the calves of our lips." Amos iii. 5—"Shall a snare spring up from the ground, and have taken nothing at all?" A.V. "Shall one take up a snare from the earth, and etc." Amos ix. 6—" [It is] he that buildeth his chambers in the heaven, and hath *founded his vault* upon the earth:" A.V. "Buildeth his stories, . . . founded his troop." Micah i. 15—"The glory of Israel shall come even unto Adullam:" A.V. "He shall come unto Adullam, the glory of Israel." Hab. ii. 6—"Woe to him . . . that *ladeth himself with pledges*:" A.V. "Woe to him . . . that ladeth himself with thick clay." Hab. iii. 6—"The everlasting hills did bow: his goings were as of old:" A.V. "The perpetual hills did bow: his ways [are] everlasting." Hag. ii. 9—"The latter glory of this house shall be greater than the former:" A.V. "The glory of this latter house shall be greater than the former."¹

¹ Besides the passages already noticed in the text and in preceding Papers, we invite the student's attention to unassailable emendations in the following passages:—Gen. vi. 16, xx. 16, xxv. 18, xxvii. 40, xlix. 6; Deut. xxxiii. 6; Judg. v. 7, 15, 17; 1 Sam. i. 28, xv. 12; 2 Sam. i. 18, iii. 8; Job vi. 26, vii. 20, ix. 22, xi. 10, 12, xiii. 12, 27, xix. 17, xxii. 20, 25, xxvi. 12, xxxi. 31, 35, xxxiii. 23, xl. 23, xli. 6, 25; Ps. x. 2-4, xxii. 8, 29, xxxii. 9, xxxvii. 8, lxxviii. 30, lxxiv. 5, lxxxiv. 6, xc. 7, cxix. 61, 113, 138, cxxviii. 3, cxxxvii. 7, cxli. 5; Prov. x. 23, xx. 30, xxvi. 8, xxvii. 21; Eccl. ii. 25, v. 17, viii. 10; Song ii. 7; Isa. ix. 1, xv. 5, xxii. 18, xxiii. 5, xxvii. 8, 12, xxxviii. 10, xl. 3, 9, xlv. 9, lviii. 4, lxiv. 4; Jer. xxi. 3, xlviii. 27, l. 11; Lam. iv. 3, 7, v. 10, 13; Dan. ix. 25, 26; Hos. v. 2, vi. 9, vii. 4, viii. 5, ix. 13, x. 10, xi. 6, xiii. 9, 12; Amos v. 21, vii. 2; Obad. i. 12; Mic. i. 7, vi. 11, 14; Nah. i. 10; Hab. iii. 11; Hag. i. 2; Mal. iv. 2.

A. C. JENNINGS,
W. H. LOWE.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL IN THE LIGHT OF
RECENT RESEARCH AND DISCOVERY.

III. CYRUS.

THE fame of the great conqueror is celebrated in Scripture, in inscriptions, and in profane history. From Isaiah, Daniel, and Ezra; from annalistic tablet and cylinder; from Herodotus, Ktesias, and Xenophon, the student of to-day may cull and sift his materials. They want sifting.

(1) Herodotus had at his command "three ways in which the story of Cyrus was told, all differing from his own narrative." With laudable sobriety he declares that he "followed those Persian authorities whose object it appeared to be not to magnify the exploits of Cyrus, but to relate the simple truth."¹ That sobriety only produced "a beautiful narrative sufficiently romantic."² But Mr. Grote's verdict, if not declined by Canon Rawlinson,³ is now set aside as too mild. Messrs Blakesley, Mahaffy, Wiedemann, Sayce and others refuse on various grounds to exonerate the "Father of history" from that verdict of antiquity which dubbed him consciously dishonest. He is to be reckoned "a mere λογόποιος," "no more trustworthy than Marco Polo or Defoe." "In his account of Persia, as of Babylonia and of Egypt, the affectation of a knowledge he did not possess, and concealment of the sources from which he derived his information, diminish his authority. . . . It is only where his statements are confirmed by the native monuments which modern research has brought to light that we can rely upon them. . . . Egyptology and Assyriology have made it impossible for us ever again to accept the unsupported assertions of Herodotus in matters pertaining to the East."⁴ Xenophon is no better.

¹ *Herod.*, i. 95.

² Grote's *Hist. of Greece*, iv. 112.

³ *The History of Herodotus*, i. 68 n. 6.

⁴ Cf. Sayce's *Herodotus* pp. xxiv.-xxxii. Brüll, in his *Herodots Babylonische Nachrichten*, estimates the historian more highly, at least as regards inaccuracy in Babylonian matters.

"The Cyropædia is memorable and interesting, considered with reference to the Greek mind, and as a philosophical novel." "Xenophon has selected the life of Cyrus as the subject of a moral romance, which for a long time was cited as authentic history, and which even now serves as an authority, express or implied, for disputable and even incorrect conclusions."¹

(2) If now we turn to Scripture, are we on safer, firmer ground? So we have been taught, and so we have been accustomed to think—until lately. I collect some of the passages² which deal with Cyrus. In Isaiah's pages, the Lord saith of him, "He is My shepherd, and shall perform all My pleasure."³ In one passage, he is "a ravenous bird from the east, the man of My counsel:"⁴ in another, "I have raised up one from the north, and he is come; from the rising of the sun one that calleth upon My name; and he shall come upon rulers (*marg. deputies*) as upon mortar, and as the potter treadeth clay."⁵ His worth and work are described in the well-known passage: "Thus saith the Lord to His anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him, and I will loose the loins of kings; to open the doors before him, and the gates shall not be shut; I will go before thee, and make the rugged places plain: I will break in pieces the doors of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron: and I will give thee the treasures of darkness, and hidden riches of secret places, that thou mayest know that I am the Lord, Which call thee by thy name, even the God of Israel. For Jacob My servant's sake, and Israel My chosen, I have called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known Me. I am the Lord, and there is

¹ Grote, iv. 110, 142.

² I give them from the Revised Version.

³ Isa. xlv. 28. It will be noticed that the Rev. Ver. retains the translation "shepherd," as against the rendering "friend" advocated *e.g.* by Kuenen.

⁴ Isa. xlv. 11.

⁵ Isa. xli. 25.

none else; beside Me there is no God: I will gird thee, though thou hast not known Me.”¹

A simple exegesis has hitherto found in these extracts a conviction that Cyrus was a chosen instrument in God's hand, and chosen (*int. al.*) because there would be recognised in him as a Zoroastrian a reverence for monotheism as opposed to polytheism.² Something akin to this conception of his character, as estimated in Scripture, has usually been found in the language of (a) his proclamation:—“In the first year of Cyrus king of Persia, that the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah might be accomplished, the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus king of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, and put it also in writing, saying, Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, All the kingdoms of the earth hath the Lord, the God of heaven, given me; and He hath charged me to build Him an house in Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Whosoever there is among you of all His people, his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord, the God of Israel, (He is God,) which is in Jerusalem. And whosoever is left, in any place where he sojourneth, let the men of his place help him with silver, and with gold, and with goods, and with beasts, beside the freewill offering for the house of God which is in Jerusalem”³:—and of (b) the decree which followed it: “In the first year of Cyrus the king, Cyrus the king made a decree; Concerning the house of God at Jerusalem, let the house be builded, the place where they offer sacrifices, and let the foundations thereof be strongly laid: . . . and let the expenses be given out of the king's house: and also let the gold and silver vessels of the house of God, which Nebuchadnezzar took forth out of the temple which

¹ Isa. xlv. 1-5.

² Cf. *int. al.* Stanley's brilliant pages, *History of the Jewish Church*, iii. 47-9 (ed. 1883).

³ Ezra i. 1-4; cf. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, 23.

is at Jerusalem, and brought unto Babylon, be restored, and brought again unto the temple which is at Jerusalem, every one to its place, and thou shalt put them in the house of God.”¹

Now, however, such conceptions of the character and motives of Cyrus are to be surrendered. “We must give up the belief that Cyrus was a monotheist, bent on destroying the idols of Babylon. . . . Cyrus was a polytheist, who, like other polytheists in other ages, adopted the gods of the country he had conquered from motives of state policy.”² He was “a complete religious indifferentist,” says Dr. Cheyne,³ “willing to go through any amount of ceremonies to soothe the prejudices of a susceptible population.” “The theory,” we are told, “which held that Cyrus had allowed the Jews to return to their own land; because, like them, he believed in but one supreme god, the Ormazd or good spirit of the Zoroastrian creed—must be abandoned. God consecrated Cyrus to be His instrument in restoring His chosen people to their land, not because the king of Elam was a monotheist, but because the period of Jewish trial and punishment had come to an end.”⁴ Henceforward, we must “detract somewhat from the accuracy of the inspired prophet” (Isaiah), to whom Cyrus “appears like an idealized David,” and one “whose conquest of Babylon was to be the signal of an iconoclasm which marks the downfall of the false religions.”⁵

¹ Ezra vi. 3-5. I must confess myself quite unable to see with Kuenen (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 134) that the language of this edict and that of the proclamation (Ezra i. 1, etc.) are mutually contradictory. The one is a proclamation, the other a decree; the one is supplementary to the other: the one is general, the other special.

² Sayce, *Fresh Light*, etc., p. 149; cf. *The Ancient Empires of the East*, p. 246.

³ *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, ii. 290 (3rd edition). See also Canon Rawlinson, *The Character and Writings of Cyrus the Great*, in the *Contemporary Review* for Jan. 1880, p. 93.

⁴ Sayce, *Fresh Light*, pp. 149, 150.

⁵ Cheyne, *Ibid.*

On reading such conclusions, we must do something more than share the regret with which some of their advocates affirm that they have reached them. Rather, we have to ask, Upon what are they based? And the answer is, Upon the lately discovered Cyrus-inscriptions.

I. I have already given the pith of these important documents.¹ If, alas! I cannot read a word of the originals, I do not for a moment dispute the general accuracy of the translations. The names of the translators are sufficient guarantee to all reasonable men. But I do, with all respect, consider "not proven" the conclusions which have been drawn from them: and I rise from the re-perusal of Scripture and inscription with a renewed conviction that the prophet is more trustworthy than the Babylonian scribe, and that the truer character of Cyrus is to be gathered not from the inscriptions of Babylon, but from the records of Scripture.

Let us give to the language of the inscriptions the fullest possible force. In them Cyrus is called the "young servant" of Merodach, the patron-deity of Babylon. Merodach "proclaimed him by name for the sovereignty. . . . He beheld with joy the deeds of his vicegerent, who was righteous in hand and heart. . . . To his city of Babylon he summoned his march, . . . like a friend and a comrade he went by his side." Cyrus himself asserts, "I am Cyrus . . . of the ancient seed-royal, whose rule has been beloved by Bel and Nebo, whose sovereignty they cherished according to the goodness of their hearts. . . . My vast armies (Merodach) marshalled peacefully in the midst of Babylon. . . . For the work (of restoring the shrine) of Merodach, the great lord, I prepared; and he graciously drew nigh unto me, Cyrus, the king, his worshipper, and to Kambyases, my son. . . . The gods of Sumer and Accad. . . . I settled in peace in their sanctuaries by the command of Merodach, the great lord.

¹ EXPOSITOR for March, 1885, p. 220, etc.

In the goodness of their hearts may all the gods whom I have brought into their strong places daily intercede before Bel and Nebo that they should grant me length of days: may they bless my projects with prosperity, and may they say to Merodach my lord that Cyrus the king, thy worshipper, and Kambyases his son (deserve his favour)."¹

This is the language not of a polytheist (in the sense advocated), not of an indifferentist, not of a syncretist, but of an ardent devotee of Merodach, Bel, and Nebo. The name of Ormazd does not appear once; there is not the slightest allusion to Zoroastrian belief. Let this be granted unhesitatingly, but—and this is the real question—does the language of the inscriptions represent as a matter of course the only true belief of Cyrus?

From whence came these inscriptions? Who wrote them? They are usually admitted to be Babylonian in language and in form of writing; to have been written by the Babylonian priest-class, and to be couched in the style of the Chaldæan hierarchy. If so, must they not have been compiled with the evident intention of conciliating the Babylonians and representing to them their new master from a Babylonian point of view? It has been pointed out² with a good deal of probability, that the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus was facilitated by the support he received from friends within the camp of Nabonidus. There were two great parties alienated from or angry with Nabonidus, and there was a third party looking for deliverance at all hazards. (α) The first was the band of conspirators tired of the indolent and irreligious monarch whom they had once helped to raise to power: a party probably supported by that "ancienne noblesse" which had never forgiven the act of usurpation by which Nabonidus had become king. (β) The second was yet

¹ For the sake of justice to one whose opinions I venture to question, I give these extracts from Professor Sayce's translation only (*Fresh Light*, etc., pp. 142-8).

² See Evers, *Das Emporkommen der persischen Macht unter Cyrus*, p. 12.

more powerful: the priest-class of Babylon. Their religious instincts were outraged and their interests neglected by the degenerate prince, and the devotees of Merodach and Bel turned against one who did not fulfil the promise of his earlier years. When Babylon had fallen, and its fall was to be recorded in the national archives, who would give the order for the inscription, and who would draw up the account? If it may be safely asserted that Cyrus or some one representing him would issue the order, may it not be as safely asserted that they who drew up the narrative graven on the lately discovered cylinder were not the same as those who drew up the decrees of Ezra i. 2 etc., vi. 3 etc? The very intimation that there was one "archive"-house in Babylon and another at Ecbatana in Media¹ supposes record-draughtsmen at both, whose language would reflect their respective nationalities and creeds. The Cyrus-cylinder represents Babylonian thought and belief; no Median or Persian would have composed it as it stands, even if he were ready to admit that Cyrus could and would command both the writing of it and the deposit of papyrus-copies in the other archives. If the exclusion of all but Babylonian belief is of itself a testimony to the inscription having emanated from Babylonian sources, does that therefore stamp it as containing the only true reflection of the personal faith of Cyrus? Granted that it served the purpose of a political manifesto, that it expressed what would wound as little as possible, or even flatter, the national vanity of the inhabitants of Babylon, yet is it not too hasty to regard it as classifying the Persian who sanctioned it as either indifferentist or polytheist?

(γ) There was yet a third party in Babylon. The position occupied by that party is not without its bearing on this

¹ Cf. Ezra vi. 1 with verse 2. There was a third at Susa, the records of which were employed by the writer of the Book of Esther (ayce, *Introduction to Ezra*, etc., p. 96)

point. That third party was that of the Jews. They had never lost sight of the promises of deliverance announced to them by the Prophets; their calculations bade them at this very time look forward to a speedy termination of the captivity.¹ "Babylon is fallen" is a cry which, it is not at all improbable, they helped to realize. And if they were in any degree instrumental in advancing the interests of Cyrus, would or could he neglect or forget them? History has answered by pointing to his proclamations and decree of restoration. Analyse the style of those documents, and it is no longer that of the Babylonian scribe but of the Median or Persian; they express no Babylonian belief but that of a monotheist. I do not read in them the language of a worshipper of Israel's Jehovah; but the acts they announce are in accordance with the conception of the person and work of Cyrus met with in the Prophets,² and are quite consistent with the conduct of a firm believer in the monotheistic principle of Zoroastrianism.

II. This, however, brings us face to face with the second statement. We are asked to believe that Cyrus knew nothing about Ormazd; that he was an idolater pure and simple. If we ask, Upon what grounds? the advocates of the polytheistic tendencies of Cyrus allege, in support of their hypothesis, the title "King of Ansan" assigned to him in the Cyrus-cylinder. In the third year of Nabonidus, the army of Astyages, king of Media, revolted and delivered their king to Cyrus, "King of Ansan," and to Ansan Cyrus is described as bringing the goods which he captured at Ecbatana.³ Some cuneiform scholars replace the title

¹ Few writers have brought together the Scripture passages in more picturesque language than the late Dean Stanley. See *History of the Jewish Church*, iii. Lect. xlii. *pass.*

² Notice the undesigned confirmation of this supplied by the Babylonian inscription itself. "All their peoples I (Cyrus) assembled, and I restored their lands" (Sayce, *Fresh Light*, etc., p. 148). This principle applied to the component peoples of his empire, would not be withheld from the Jews who had assisted him.

³ Cf. Pinches' translation in *T.S.B.A.*, vii. 141.

Ansan by Elam¹ (Susiana) with which they identify it, and advance this identification in support of their view that Cyrus was not a Persian but an Elamite, and—if, by descent of Aryan blood—by birth and education belonging to another race.² This opinion is shared and upheld by such scholars as Sayce, Halévy, Floigl and others.

It is very presumptuous on my part, but the difficulties attendant upon this identification seem to me simply insuperable; and the deductions from it based upon perilously insufficient grounds.

Take first the identification of Ansan. What and where was it? Was it a city, or a plain, or a district? Was it in Susiana, or in Persia, or Assyria? These points are, in the opinion of some critics, so uncertain, that they prefer to pronounce themselves better able to say where Ansan was not than to say where it was.³ In the face of this uncertainty, and in the face of much difference of opinion as regards the translation of the cuneiform records containing the name, is it possible to affirm positively this identification of Ansan with Elam?

But the name Cyrus itself is supposed to relieve us of this uncertainty. It is suggested that it is a "non-Aryan" name, and indicates that Cyrus was not of Persian but of Elamite origin.⁴ This is not the view which has been hitherto held. Until the appearance of the Cyrus-cylinder—or rather until the identification of Ansan with Elam—Cyrus was considered to be a Persian by birth, and of the race of the Achæmenids, who raised by various acts of conquest the Persians to the supremacy of the East. In the Bible, in the Greek historians, and in the Persian in-

¹ Cf. Sayce, *Fresh Light*, etc., p. 143; and see the *EXPOSITOR* for March, 1885, p. 221.

² See Sayce's *Introduction to Ezra*, etc., p. 45.

³ The various opinions may be seen collected in Evers, *Das Emporkommen der persischen Macht unter Cyrus*, pp. 31-2.

⁴ *The Ancient Empires of the East*, pp. 143-4. Cf. also p. 243.

scriptions he is the "King of Persia." Even in the Babylonian annalistic tablet, if called "King of Ansan" (the title also in the Cyrus-cylinder of his father Cambyses and grandfather Teispes)¹ in the sixth year of Nabonidus, he is called in that king's ninth year "King of Persia," the lesser title being merged in the greater. The question now arises, Which view are we to take? Before we are "off with the old and on with the new," must it not be asked, Has the new view, which has now been some years before scholars, met universal acceptance at their hands? Surely not. In addition to its resting on the *uncertain* identification of Ansan with Elam, (α) M. de Harlez seems to me to have not only reasserted successfully the Aryan character of the name of Cyrus,² but also to have with others proved that Susa became his chief city only after the subjugation of the Median empire.³ And (β), Is it possible to resist the testimony of the Behistun inscription?⁴ This makes no distinction between the faith or family of Darius Hystaspis, and that of his predecessors Cambyses and Cyrus. Ormazd is the god of them all; and the unity of the Achæmenian family asserted throughout, is of itself opposed to another *uncertainty* adduced in connexion with this question, viz. an hypothesis that the two sons of Teispes parted from each other, and established separate kingdoms, of which that which was the abode of Cyrus was peopled by a non-Aryan and idolatrous race.

For these reasons I respectfully submit that the Cyrus-cylinder does not give the truest account of the character and faith of Cyrus. I see no reason for surrendering the Scripture estimate of this prince, or for preferring to the Persian inscriptions a cuneiform Babylonian record which it is probable that Cyrus never saw, could not have read

¹ Cf. Budge, *Babylonian Life and History*, p. 81. In each case Sayce reads "King of Elam;" cf. *Fresh Light*, etc., p. 147.

² *Muséon*, i. p. 557, etc. ³ Cf. Evers, *Das Emporkommen*, etc., p. 35, etc.

⁴ See *Records of the Past*, i. p. 107, etc.; vii. p. 85, etc.

had he seen it, and which M. Oppert has pronounced one of the most difficult to decipher among the many records of the past.

J. M. FULLER.

King's College, London.

A STUDY IN THE CONNEXION OF DOCTRINES.

GALATIANS ii. 20.

GREAT is the interest of this verse, alike to the student of the spiritual history of St Paul and to the reverent investigator of revealed truth at large. Here is the great Apostle of Justification in the midst of one of his main treatments of the subject, a treatment full of the force and absoluteness of statement called out by special circumstances of peril to the truth in hand. Well, he opens up to us, in passing, out of the depths of his own experience of revealed certainties, and in strong and living coherence with the main truth before him, something also of the central secret of the inner life in Christ and by Christ. And accordingly, as we look through St Paul's experience at the eternal truths for which alone it is recorded, we have given us here the thought that the Divine gifts of our acceptance in Christ and of holiness through Christ's life in us, are things which lie vitally together, in the plan of God and in the experience of the disciple. "Christ liveth IN me; Who gave Himself FOR me."

I attempt no examination of the entire passage. The words just quoted are, for the present purpose, its essence. The IN-ness and the FOR-ness of Christ, in their connexion, here is our immediate and sufficient study. I attempt it with a humble sense of the depths that surround it, and well remembering that every action of the Christian's mind is to be carried on under recognition of the presence and in-

dwelling of the Lord Christ. Let this chasten and humble the whole enquiry.

The two great ideas whose connexion we have in view can scarcely be disputed as facts (apart from *minutiæ* of theory) by any student who completely and cordially SUBMITS to the authority of Scripture. Christ is IN the believing man, in such a sense that there is not only sympathy between the two, sympathy of the kind quite common between man and man, but organic spiritual connexion, vital union. Such is this union, whose act of contact and coherence on our side is faith, that it is figured and illustrated in Scripture by the strongest and intensest sorts of material coherence; and we may be very sure that the illustration is not more strong and solid than the thing. My connexion, as a believing man, with Christ is not less intense and vivifying and penetrating, but more, than that of my limbs with my head, with myself. Little as I can analyse and define in such a matter, I can be largely certain that in a sense far more than figurative the life of the exalted Christ is *solidaire* with mine, pervades and possesses me, who am "joined to Him" (1 Cor. vi. 17) by the *nexus* (on my side) of accepting trust. Certain schools of mystic theology may have pushed, may still push, this side of spiritual fact out of proportion; into a place and scale which Scripture abundantly corrects. But all the more is it necessary to recognise and hail the truth *within* its proper sphere, unless we wish to take the surest means of giving a strong impetus to the related illusion. The Risen One lives, in a sense very far transcending metaphor, IN His people. He does not cancel their personality, but, with the power that can "subdue all things unto Himself," He annexes it, may we say, to His own, and pervades it with His Life. "The Life of Jesus is manifested," comes out from an indwelling latency, "in their mortal flesh."

And this profound connexion exists not anywhere but within the sphere of faith. Actually, as to experience, biography, individual result, it subsists not between Christ and men, but between Christ and believing men. I am well aware how much has been said, with deep moral earnestness, on the other side. I know that Gal. i. 16, has been explained to mean that the Son of God was always "in" Paul, and that Paul's conversion was but the discovery and realization of the latent fact. But I venture to traverse this theory with the deliberate plea, urged, I trust, in the spirit of entire submission to Scripture, that the drift of Scripture is another way. On the whole, Scripture contemplates men as dead, devoid of Divine life, till they enter into Christ. Their initial need is not to awake to the fact of in-ness, but to attain it. And our in-ness in Christ and Christ's in-ness in us are viewed in Scripture as coincident and correspondent facts.

There is a something, then, in the mystery of things, in the reason of spiritual things, which ties the fact of the in-ness of Christ in me to the fact of my "believing on His name;" if the main evidence of Scripture is really to rule the case. So much, in brief indication, on the side of the fact, and the conditions, of "IN-ness."

Again, and in the same way, the FOR-ness of Christ for believing men is given as a spiritual fact in Scripture; such "FOR-ness" that, in a sense which by no means asks to be elaborately explained away, He "BORE their SINS." And if submission to scriptural thought and phrase is to be our rule, can we doubt that "to bear sins" means to suffer by way of penalty for them? A study of the phrase "sin bearing," in its usage throughout Scripture, appears to be decisive on this point. The scriptural idea of the phrase is not that of sympathetic entrance into the wrong of the offender's act, or into the justice of the displeasure of the offended person. It is that of penal suffering, endurance of retribution, for

the act done. And Christ bore our sins in this sense. No student of Atonement doctrine can forget for a moment the controversies that have gathered round that phrase. But I humbly venture to say that very many such discussions would have been precluded by a complete *submission* to Scripture as final authority, which was the attitude of our Lord; and that very many more would have been precluded by a deeper view of the connexion of doctrines, instead of a pursuance of the question as if Atonement truth could be studied quite alone, in isolation; isolation for instance, from the revealed fact of an "eternal covenant."

I may say in passing that when I speak of the "for-ness" of Christ for "believing men," I by no means intend that there is no such thing as His "for-ness" for MAN. But I hold that the two ideas belong, in a sense, to different planes, or lines, of truth. And I am speaking now in the line which concerns actual and individual grant and possession; of that aspect of God's Will in which that Will is seen in what takes place in fact. Those who are in this sense, personally, biographically, accepted before God because of the atoning work of Christ FOR us, are those who "believe on His name." When we come out of the region of undistributed to that of distributed purposes and effects of the atoning Work, then surely, if (I repeat it) we submit out and out to Scripture, we come to a view of the Atonement in which it avails for the acceptance of the believing Church alone.

All this, meanwhile, claims to be held in the chastened remembrance, that we have revealed to us not the whole of His ways, but parts. The plan of salvation is not a map finished to the very edge, with latitude and longitude complete. It is a map; it has its definiteness and precision. But it is still *bordered* with the cloud of multifold mystery *around*.

The "in-ness" and the "for-ness" of Christ, in and for

His people, are thus, then, given facts of the Scriptures. How may we, in some brief indications, trace their connexion? Certainly not by a process of *fusion*. Some important schools and venerable names have adopted more or less completely that exposition. It has been suggested that the indwelling Lord is Himself, as such, the reason of the acceptance of His people. The Father is well pleased with them because the Son is in them. The incumbrances and defects of their present state, their sinfulness and their sins, are to be met, for acceptance, on this line. One singular, I had almost said beautiful, refinement of theory maintains that the Eternal Eyes see the believer, possessed by the indwelling of his Lord, not as he is, but as he will be in the sphere of glory, if the work runs out to its ideal issues. He to Whom there is no time, sees what to us is the bud as already the flower, and smiles accordingly with entire acceptance on what is still, within its own limits and experience, only a bud. There is much to criticise in detail here. But there is one broad fact which seems to cross the scheme decisively; its failure to recognise the claims of the LAW of God. In the whole theory one misses that of which Scripture is full to overflowing, not the recognition merely but the jealous vindication of the sanctity and awful authority of the holy Law, the Law viewed as no mere sequence of spiritual phenomena, but as the "categorical imperative" of the eternal King and Judge. Too often, and in many fields of theological thought, this discrepancy with the tone and proportion of Scripture has to be deplored; a tendency to "dwell upon the beauty of virtue, but less upon its duty;" a large recognition of sin as disease and discord, but a far fainter recognition of it as GUILT, as the thing which the Law inexorably and eternally condemns and sentences to penal death. Hence the possibility of a theory which, in effect, meets the demands of the Law, in the case of the Christian in whom Christ dwells, by a fact,

most sacred indeed, but wholly of the sphere of Life, not of the sphere of Law at all. The Law must be met lawfully. It must be met by either absolute obedience, or absolute satisfaction, of the legal kind. The Divine Indwelling itself, infinitely holy, precious, and efficacious, cannot meet this need, for it is a thing of another sphere. What can meet it but "the obedience of the One"? (Rom. v. 19).

The connexion of "in-ness" and "for-ness," then, cannot be traced by a process of fusion of the truths, or by making one the equivalent of the other.

May it not be stated, or indicated, with reverence, thus? The Lord suffered; therefore His people, His Church, are dealt with by the supreme Law, for eternal purposes, as having suffered; as having yielded perfect satisfaction to the Law. Why? We say "why" with a full recognition of the inscrutableness of many of the conditions of the fact, and in a spirit prepared to believe revelation even where it cannot see reasons. But this much of reason we surely can see (reason apprehended far more fully and strongly by the theology of the early centuries, and again of the sixteenth and seventeenth, than commonly now), that the "imputation" of merit runs upon lines *at once* of Law and of Life. It attaches not to *any* parties, but to those who are in a contact, vital, organic, real, with the obeying and satisfying Person, their Lord and Head. Where the Merit of Christ actually adheres, there the Life of Christ actually inheres, and *vice versâ*. Within the organism of His true Church, which is the sphere also of the "eternal covenant," there is nothing, no branch, no limb, that has not part in the two distinct but concurrent blessings, the Merit and the Life. Participation in the Life, participation of the kind we have tried in earlier paragraphs to indicate, carries with it at least a profound suggestion *how* the Head can so suffer beneath the stroke of the Law as that the judicial effects shall pass on to the Members. The imputation loses all

character of a "legal fiction," while yet it remains a fact essentially legal, when the solidarity of the Head and of the Members, their solidarity in a sense not conventional but real, is taken into account. The mystery of the matter doubtless is that the Head and the Members are not personally identical. But this is, to say the least of it, *relieved* by the other mystery, which is a fact of revelation, that the Head and the Members are "one spirit."

It is the province and work of Faith, in the revealed process of the Gospel, to bring the believing man into profound UNION WITH Christ. The *whole* account of its doing so is, surely, among the things unrevealed. Faith, in itself, is the simplest of actions; it is trust. In vain does the Tridentine theology "refute" the "*inanis hæreticorum FIDUCIA*" (Sess. vi. cap. ix.). The Gospels are sufficient witness to the entire simplicity of idea which the Lord Himself attached to the word *πίστις*. But beneath the simplicity and certainty of the *action* may well lie an unrevealed depth of *result*, in the direction of vital spiritual processes. That perfectly simple impact of *reliance* on "the name of the Son of God" may well carry with it an inevitable, a spiritually *natural*, sequel of a vital contact and connexion between the believer and the Lord, a vital UNION quite transcending all our present analysis indeed, but none the less strong and valid in the order of the spiritual world.

It is, in any case, the revealed effect of faith to CONJOIN the believer to his Head. He enters, in that act, into Christ; and all that is in Christ under the terms of the covenant of grace, acceptance alike and vital power, is his own upon that entrance. Christ is at once, and as the sequel of the same act of entrance, FOR him and IN him, in actual and accomplished fact.

Long ago, in some of the best pages of older Anglican theology,¹ it was pointed out that Justification by Faith,

¹ See e.g. Bishop Hopkins, of Derry (cir. 1680): *On the Doctrine of the Two covenants*.

read in the light of the connexion of truths, is a brief phrase covering a profound spiritual process. In Christ resides, in His absoluteness, that Righteousness which means complete Satisfaction to the holy Law of God. It is His as the Head of a Body; it is His for the limbs of the living organism whose life is in Him. Faith, such in Him, faith in its simplest idea, unites the man, for all spiritual purposes and relations, to Christ. And so faith is the act of entrance on the possession, in Him, of a sublimely legal Justification at the same moment as that in which it is the act of entrance into actual "Life through His name."

The connexion between Justification and the Life of Christ in the soul is thus a connexion not of mutual dependence, or of the dependence of one upon another, but of common source, Christ, and common entrance, Faith. The two connected things are in themselves things wholly different in idea, and it greatly concerns the simplicity, freedom, and joy of the Christian life to keep that difference firmly in hand. The one is a thing of the sphere of legality, the other of the sphere of vitality. The one is ours from the Lord in His character of covenant Head, the other is ours from Him in His character as vital Head. But the two characters are of one Person, and that not accidentally, but in a profound necessity, as in the case of "the First Man," the solitary parallel to that of "the Second Man" (1 Cor. xv. 47).

Meanwhile these truths do not exclude, they rather intensify, the subordinate connexions (too often spoken of as if the main connexion) between Justification and the Life of Christ in the soul. Too often it has been taught that the whole account of the matter is that the boon of Justification (apprehended no doubt by a faith divinely given) acts upon the life within merely by way of motive, in the common sense of that word, awakening the soul to the love and the self-surrender of supreme gratitude;

and that this is, practically, all the *nexus*. Here there is manifest fact, but in wrong proportion. The Divine Life does not appear, in Scripture, to be meant to lift its human subject above the region of motive; and mighty is indeed the motive-power of a full apprehension of what the Atonement has done in the rescue and the protection of the believer. But that motive can, surely, exercise its proper power only upon a being re-constituted into Divine Life through the Spirit of God; a Life which, but for the Atonement, would have been inaccessible, but which has its fountain not in the Atonement, but directly in Christ. It is a life whose *presence* does not depend on the excitation of "motives," and in which motives therefore may have all the freer and nobler action.

This is latent in the passage which introduced these reflections. The Apostle surrenders himself to the mighty fact of the Indwelling: "Christ liveth in me." He makes use of it, by faith, under the animating certainty, "He loved me, and gave Himself for me." *Αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα, καὶ νῦν, καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος.*

H. C. G. MOULE.

Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

FRÉDÉRIC GODET.

IN a letter which appears in a recently published biography, we come upon some interesting recollections of a day spent many years since in the Prussian palace of Babelsberg. "About a week ago," the writer says, "I went with a very dear friend to make a visit to the tutor of the young prince who, if he lives, will one day be king of Prussia . . . No prince could have a better tutor . . . He is one of those men with whom I feel, after the first five minutes, that increased acquaintance will be only increased pleasure. Loveliness is the characteristic of the man. We were

soon deeply engaged exchanging, not discussing, views on Christian theology and the Christian life." These memoranda, which date so far back as 1839, give the impression produced upon a distinguished American theologian, the late Professor Henry Boynton Smith of New York, by his first meeting with one who was destined to take still higher rank among Christian scholars. The young Swiss teacher, then holding a responsible trust in the Prussian court, and described with such frank appreciation in his early manhood (he was but in his 27th year), is the Frédéric Godet of Neuchâtel who has become so honourably known in many countries, nor least in our own. In his case the promise of youth has been so amply fulfilled that he stands without dispute in the front rank of the Evangelical theologians of the day. It has been his ambition, he tells us in the Preface to one of his best books, to do something in his weakness for the Church of France, whose position at present seems to him to be graver than in the days of bloody persecution. That ambition has not missed its satisfaction. He has done much for the Church of France, and much for the small but generous branch of the Church to which he personally belongs, and in connexion with which he has been a sufferer for conscience' sake. But his services to Christian truth have gone far beyond these limits, and his name belongs to Evangelical Christendom generally. Some notes on the career of a scholar of this distinction may be acceptable and opportune. More cannot be attempted. Obvious reasons forbid us to say all that we might wish to give expression to about one who happily is still with us, and of whom those who know him best will be the readiest to affirm that the picture of his youth as "most lovely, most Christian," is also the picture of the eventide of his life.

Frédéric Godet was born on the 25th October, 1812, in the town which is still his home. His father, a man eminent

in his own profession, that of the law, died prematurely. His mother devoted the resources of a strong character and high intelligence to his early training, and to her he owes very much. His preparatory studies were prosecuted in Neuchâtel, until he was ready to take up theology. He then left the Swiss college, and sought the acquaintance of sacred science in her chosen haunts in Germany. Between the years 1831 and 1835 he spent a studious and fruitful life in the great centres of Berlin and Bonn. There he caught the spell of some of the most notable teachers of the day, including Hengstenberg, Tholuck, Nitzsch, Steffens, Neander, Schleiermacher and others. With the rigorous dogmatism of Hengstenberg at the one end and the fluid speculation of Schleiermacher at the other, the line of theological influence along which he travelled did not lack variety. Of all these teachers, however, the one whom he attended most assiduously and from whom he received the strongest impulse was Neander. Nor is it difficult to recognise in his writings the happy influence of this simplest, purest and most learned of theologians, the devout and creative genius whose teaching has been justly pronounced to have been "a benediction to thousands." Of the rest we should judge Schleiermacher the one who set his mark most deeply upon him—more deeply perhaps than Frédéric Godet was quite conscious of or might altogether admit. It is seen both in his theological method and in the general cast of his theological system. It appears in the instinct with which all doctrinal discussion is made to start from and return to the Person of Christ, in the large account taken of the human side in that Person, in the speculative construction of the Divine-human Personality which satisfies him best in the penetrating sense of the vital interest of faith in every point of the Christological problem. Like many others of the leading Evangelical divines of our time, he has drawn much more than seems at first sight to con-

sist with radical differences in doctrine from this master-mind in the reconstruction of nineteenth-century theology.

There were other influences, however, telling upon him at this period of his life, beside those that were directly academic. He became intimate with men like Otto von Gerlach, the pious and warm-hearted author of the popular Exposition of the Bible which proved so helpful in the revival of religion in Prussia. Of still more importance was his friendship with Baron von Kottwitz—the venerable Christian nobleman who exercised so gracious a power over many in Berlin smitten by the shock of the conflict between intellect and faith, and to whom men like Tholuck confessed that they owed their own selves. Influences like these saved the speculative genius from becoming dominant in Frédéric Godet, and touched the deep springs of the living Christian consciousness in him.

Returning to Neuchâtel on the completion of his theological studies, he was ordained to the Christian ministry in 1837. When he had but the briefest experience of its practical work, however, another great change took place in his life. In 1838 he was recalled to Berlin in order to undertake the post already referred to—the post of superintending the education of Frederick William of Prussia, the Crown Prince, now known to all the world as the hero of battles, and heir to a mightier dominion than was dreamed of in the former days at Babelsberg. He retained this position till 1844, discharging its duties with wisdom and with a firmness of discipline of which some entertaining instances are left on record. He had the confidence of his pupil as well as of the royal house, and it is pleasant to know that the intimacy between the scholar and the teacher has suffered no break. In the anxieties of politics and the throes of war, and through all the changes which these long years have brought, the Prince maintained a frequent and kindly correspondence with his valued tutor.

Marrying in 1844, he obtained the office of deacon of the Churches of the Val de Ruz, and became resident again in his native city. Here he devoted himself with great energy to the practical work of the Churches, the organization of Sabbath schools and other kindred agencies. He found time, also, to carry on a variety of studies—in theology, the interpretation of the Bible, geology and ethnography. He had the stimulus of excellent associates in these studies. He worked in conjunction with M. Bovet on the Old Testament, with M. Prince (the philologue to whom he dedicates his Commentary on John) on the New Testament; while in physical enquiries he had the companionship of M. Alfred Guyot, late Professor in Princeton, N. J., and author of the treatise on *Creation in the Light of Modern Science*. Along with Frédéric de Rougemont, too, he took part in a scheme for the translation of the writings of eminent German divines—Olshausen, Tholuck and others. Traces of all these studies appear in his later works.

At length the position for which he was best fitted came in his way. In 1850 he was appointed Professor of Theology at Neuchâtel, having charge at first of New Testament Criticism and Exegesis and afterwards also of Old Testament Introduction. Next year a pastorate was added to his professorship. In both posts he laboured with brilliant devotedness and success. In the pastorate he did so much that Neuchâtel and its neighbourhood probably owe more to him than to any other for the numerous religious agencies and philanthropic institutions which they possess.

This work, however, by and by proved too heavy for him. Although he achieved marked influence in the pulpit (his preaching being not less remarkable for the power and variety of its applications to conscience and life than for its fine exegetical quality), he found it necessary, in 1866, to resign his pastoral charge. Giving himself then more

completely to theology and literary work, he retained, nevertheless, his quick interest in the practical movements of the Church, and in the promotion of Evangelical effort. In 1873 came the crisis in his ecclesiastical life. The Church of Neuchâtel had been practically a free Church since the Reformation. The yoke of Rome had been thrown off by the people themselves, in answer to the powerful preaching of Farel and without the intervention of the State. The new Church placed itself under the government of the "Company of Pastors," and continued so down to the year 1848. At that time a change took place in the old constitution in consequence of the disruption of the relations in which the State of Neuchâtel had stood to Prussia since the beginning of the eighteenth century. But the new governing body was a synod consisting of pastors and laymen chosen by the Churches, and the same body was entrusted with the appointment of professors of theology. So matters stood until 1865, when a disturbed condition entered which ended after some years in the promulgation of a new ecclesiastical law. By this law every citizen was declared a member of the Church in virtue of his birth, and was given the right to vote; every minister was declared eligible to office in virtue of his licence to preach and apart from subscription to any creed; and the appointment of professors of theology was transferred from the Synod to the Grand Council. These statutes were felt by Dr. Godet to introduce doctrinal anarchy into the Church, to confound the spiritual with the civil and the Church with the nation, and to make the Theological Faculty the creature of the State. He found it impossible to submit, and, along with some friends of kindred spirit, finally separated himself from the National Church as thus reconstituted. It was a time of great trial. We find him speaking of it now and again in terms which indicate how deep it cut. But like Luther on a larger platform, he felt

conscience to be in question, and he could not do otherwise. He took a leading part in the formation of the Free Church of Neuchâtel, which now numbers a membership of over 12,000 and has given a conspicuous example of self-sacrifice. His work as a theological professor was continued in the altered circumstances, and the influence which he had gained in the old connexion went with him into the new.

Dr. Godet's literary activity has been great. Were we to enumerate all his writings, the list would be a very long one. He has been a large contributor to Journals and Reviews, the *Revue Chrétienne*, the *Revue Théologique de Montauban*, the *Journal religieux de Neuchâtel* and others abroad, the present Journal and others in our own country. He has issued a number of minor publications, brochures on the theory of *Multitudinism* and other ecclesiastical questions, Sermons, Addresses, and Reports on public occasions. He has written Articles for Theological Dictionaries in various languages. He is taking a leading part at present in the preparation of the *Bible Annotée*, an exposition of the Scriptures which is intended to put the people in possession of the best results of recent scholarship. The section on the Old Testament Prophets, which has been taken first in hand, admirably answers the idea, and contains much acute exegesis expressed in popular form. His greater works include the well-known Commentary on John's Gospel, published in 1863-65, and now in a third and revised edition (1881-85); his Commentary on Luke's Gospel, of which the second edition appeared in 1871; his volume of Apologetical Discourses, published in 1869, in reply to the attacks of Buisson, Pécaut and Réville, on the Bible and the orthodox faith, and translated into English under the title of *The Defence of the Faith*; his two series of Biblical Studies, on the Old Testament and on the New, the third edition of the latter having been

issued in 1876; his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, published in 1879-80, the first volume of which is in its second edition. In addition to these we have to mention his long-expected Commentary on First Corinthians, which will be soon in the hands of the public.

Of all these contributions to theological literature, the most important undoubtedly are the exegetical. Here Dr. Godet's gift is pre-eminent. It would be too much to claim for him equal excellence in all the qualities which go to make the ideal exegete. We see him at his weakest probably in matters of Textual Criticism. It is here that experts have oftenest to join issue with him. His averments on questions of Text not unfrequently betray an indisposition to follow matters to their issue, and a readiness to allow purely subjective considerations to dominate. His tendencies here are decidedly conservative. Nor is it only that he is often in conflict with the great masters in this science as regards particular readings. He seems to fail in an adequate grasp of their principles. In this he is by no means singular among Continental exegetes of the highest rank. It is otherwise on questions of literary and historical criticism. Few handle the problems of the Gospels as he handles them. His discussions of the origin, integrity, and plan of the Fourth Gospel are examples of careful analysis and lucid statement which it would be difficult to excel. He has the faculty of marshalling facts, computing their real value, and getting straight to the heart of a question through any thicket of side-issues with which it is set round. He threads his way with easy directness through the intricacies of competing views and comes at the exact point of each. Witness his summaries of the many discrepant theories on such problems as the aim of the Epistle to the Romans, the few bold strokes with which he brings out what is distinctive of each, and reduces all to their simple types. He never

fails to do justice to an opponent's position, while his own conclusions are reasoned out calmly and stated with modesty. He has given his name indeed to not a few theories which we should hesitate to accept as just solutions of difficult problems. His conceptions of the relations of the three Synoptists seem insufficient. His theory of the date of the Apocalypse presupposes a greater degree of purity in the infant Churches than probably existed. His explanation of the object of the Epistle to the Romans may not commend itself as superior to Weizsäcker's. But we can scarcely rise from the study of any of Dr. Godet's discussions of questions in these branches of criticism without feeling that at least we understand the conditions of the problem better than before, the exact measure of the contributions made to its solution by previous students, and the direction in which that solution has yet to be sought. The most intricate statement, too, is brightened by flashes of keen perception, happy home-thrusts of logic, and unflinching lucidity of expression.

It is in the direct operations of Exegesis, however, that his genius is seen at its best. Here again it is not difficult to name several who are superior to him, each in some particular gift. He is not equal to Bishop Ellicott in grammatical *finesse*, nor to Bishop Lightfoot in historical criticism and that peculiar breadth which distinguishes his method of exposition, nor to Meyer in his singular power of covering in each case almost the entire compass of the exegetical *data*. But he is excelled by none, and rivalled by few, in delicacy of spiritual touch, insight into the spirit of the several New Testament writers, clear and sympathetic reflection of their mind. Peculiar interpretations occasionally surprise us. Such is the preference for the sense of *fore-ordained* over that of *set forth* for the *προέθετο* in Romans iii. 25, a sense which seems so remote from the real point of the paragraph, that only a linguistic

argument of a quite overwhelming force could reconcile us to it. But on the other hand his pages often charm us by interpretations which fall upon us like light and almost reveal their truth to us. Of his various Commentaries that on John's Gospel ranks with most as the best. It is one of the most popular books of Continental exegesis, and deservedly so. Its merits are of the highest order. In order to do justice to Dr. Godet in this we need not do less than justice to others. Luthardt's Commentary on the same Gospel, which is in peril of being pushed into the background, was a book of more decisive influence in its time than even Dr. Godet's. We see what it was when we look back upon the use made of it, and the *find* it was felt to be by men like the late Dean Alford, when they first had the opportunity of working through the Fourth Gospel with its help. But taking up the line of interpretation which Luthardt did so much to introduce, Dr. Godet has carried it on independently, and has added to the thoroughness of the German the grace and lucidity of the Frenchman. He has the poetic faculty, too, which is one of the supreme equipments of a true interpreter of the genius of John, and like John himself, he sometimes sees where others have to reason.

His contributions to the literature of Apologetics are only second in value to his exegetical writings. They are, however, more fragmentary in form, consisting of papers and addresses prepared from time to time with a view to different exigencies. Some of them have naturally lost in worth through the march of inquiry since their publication. Even these, however, have certain special features of interest—the essay on *The Six Days of Creation*, for example, in which he adopts Hugh Miller's hypothesis in his *Testimony of the Rocks*; and the paper on the *Development of Life*, in which he starts with the Pythagorean maxim, that "man is the measure of all things," and tries to gather

from man's life the secret of the development of all life. There are others which have elements in them likely to save them from becoming rapidly antiquated. Those on the Resurrection, the Supernatural, the Holiness of Christ, the Divinity of Christ, are of this kind. In a few vivid pages, in which the real points are made to stand out unmistakable, these give the substance of trains of reasoning which have been elaborated by recent theology, and admirably popularise new methods of dealing with old questions. These papers, and others on Biblical subjects, abound in felicitous phrases and happy crystallisations of arguments, of which many instances might be given. "Miracles are possible," he says, "because matter is the work and instrument of spirit;" "matter tends to spirit, because it is the creation of spirit;" "faith cannot be founded upon argument; all that science can aspire to do is to dissipate doubts that have been suggested by science;" "the supernatural in its highest form is not the miraculous, it is holiness;" "faith is to your life that which to the life of a tree is the profound incision which opens access to the graft—to that new principle which is to change the nature of its juices and the quality of its sap;" "man is the true Janus, the god looking two ways;" "what is instinct but the power of the species manifested in the individual?"

A lively fancy vivifies and enriches all his writings. His conceptions of things take naturally the form of figures. At times this is apt to carry him off into artificial comparisons or into theories more novel than well founded. But for the most part it expresses itself in analogies and imagery which lie near the subject and add to the power of his expositions. This rich gift of imagination is wedded to a speculative power of wide range, which sometimes takes a flight into the high mysteries of the Kenotic doctrine of Christ's Person, and at other times condescends to theorize on the relation of body, soul and spirit in man. It occa-

sionally draws him into doubtful hypotheses on such subjects as the hierarchies of angels and the original monarchy of Satan over the earth. But even where we are least disposed to accept his suggestions we come upon far-reaching ideas, rare felicities of phrase, and definitions which carry us into the heart of things.

Dr. Godet has thought out independent solutions for many of the familiar problems in Criticism, Doctrine, and Interpretation. Not to speak of his acute Essays on the Books of Job and Canticles (in the former of which he sees the epic of the human conscience wrestling with the Divine Justice, and in the latter the echo of the moral shock given to the Israelitish consciousness by its first experience of the monarchy), there is his remarkable construction of the Pauline argument in Romans ix. Here he parts company both with those who read it as an assertion of absolute predestination, and with those who think that it simply sets side by side two apparent contradictories—the sovereignty of God and the freedom of man. He takes it to be a treatise directed against the doctrine of unconditional election, and intended to vindicate the rights of the Divine freedom in the election and rejection of Israel, not the rights of the Divine election in presence of human freedom. In Christological speculation he adopts the *Kenotic* theory, and in particular that form of it which has been elaborated by Gess. Scripture seems to him to teach that the Incarnation meant, not the assumption of two distinct states by one subject, but the voluntary reduction of a Divine subject to the human state. His view of the work of Christ, too, is a composite one. It is in harmony with the ordinary doctrine of the Creed, in affirming a reconciliation of God to man as well as of man to God. But at certain points it touches several other themes, especially those known as the *moral power* theory, and the theory of *public justice*. Two things, he thinks, are involved in the Atonement. There

is the sanctification of humanity, which Christ effected by His realizing in Himself the moral ideal of our nature. There is also the meeting of the Divine claims in relation to sin. And Christ's sufferings met these, not indeed by satisfying or compensating, but by revealing and recognising them.

The time is not yet when an estimate can be made of Dr. Godet's place in the Christian thought of the day. But less cannot be claimed for him than has been claimed by one of his English translators. "He combines in himself," Mr. Lyttleton justly says, "many of the most valuable characteristics of the best German, French and English theologians. Much of the depth of thought and the comprehensive knowledge of the whole literature of his subjects, of the Germans, much of the lucidity, compactness of style and epigrammatic point of the French, and of the sobriety and practical mind of the English."

S. D. F. SALMOND.

SURVEY OF RECENT ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

A NEW and most desirable style of publication is inaugurated by the volume of *Studia Biblica*¹ just issued by the Clarendon Press. The genesis of the volume is thus explained by Professors Driver, Sanday, and Wordsworth, who sign the preface: "In the autumn of the year 1883, finding ourselves recently appointed to the three chairs which represent the interpretation of Holy Scripture in the University, we took counsel together to find some means of assisting students in our department, outside the formal way of instruction by lectures. Since then we have met on four Monday evenings in every term for the purpose of reading and discussing papers on Biblical Archæology and Criticism, including also some other kindred subjects which it seemed very desirable to embrace

¹ *Studia Biblica: Essays in Biblical Archæology and Criticism*, by Members of the University of Oxford. (Clarendon Press, 1885.)

in our programme. . . . These essays are now published by the kindness of the Delegates of the Clarendon Press, in the hope that they may reach a larger circle than can be gathered in a single room." There are eleven papers now published, and of these the above-named teachers contribute five. Most of the papers are the fruit of original research, and, with one exception, they are of permanent value. The New Testament student will turn with expectation to Mr. Neubauer's contribution on the Dialects spoken in Palestine in the time of Christ. He will find it a model of its kind. It is written in a lucid and attractive style, it discusses a question of importance with ample learning, it draws its facts from a wide field and from recondite sources, it uses them with sagacity, and leaves the mind satisfied. The results reached are these: "(1) In Jerusalem, and perhaps also in the greater part of Judæa, the modernised Hebrew, and a purer Aramaic dialect were in use among the majority of the Jews. (2) The Galileans and the Jewish immigrants from the neighbouring districts understood their own dialect only (of course, closely related to Aramaic) together with a few current Hebrew expressions, such as proverbs and prayers. (3) The small Jewish-Greek colony, and some privileged persons, spoke Greek, which was, however, a translation from the Hebrew rather than genuine Greek, in a word, a Judeo-Greek jargon." The language spoken by our Lord and His disciples was therefore the Galilean Aramaic, a dialect which can be studied in the Talmud of Jerusalem. This is substantially the result which had already been arrived at by scholars named by Mr. Neubauer. The value of the essay consists in the wide range of evidence brought under review, and in the scientific manner in which it is examined. On one point the author differs from some at least of those who agree with his results. Schürer, *e.g.* who holds that Aramaic was "die alleinige Volkssprache" in Palestine in the time of Christ, seems disposed to date the introduction of Aramaic as far back as the Exile. Neubauer, on the other hand, minimizes the effect of the Exile on the language of the Jews, and would rather ascribe the introduction of the Aramaic to the influence of the Seleucidae, under whose rule Syriac became the official language of Asia. This is perhaps the one point of the paper which needs strengthening.

Mr. Gwilliam, who was associated with the late Philip Pusey in the preparation of a critical edition of the Peshito, contributes a paper on a Syriac MS. of the 5th century. One need not be a

Syriac scholar to appreciate the importance of the result to which the study of this MS. leads ; for it plainly compels the conclusion that at the period when the Greek uncials now accepted as most authoritative were written, the Syrian Church favoured a text different from that which they represent.

The Corbey MS. containing a Latin version of the Epistle of St. James, receives compensation for a long period of neglect, by the learned labours now bestowed upon it by Professors Wordsworth and Sanday. The papers of both these scholars embody, as need scarcely be said, a large amount of careful investigation and solid work. Professor (now Bishop—and it is with trepidation one sees so exceptionally qualified a specialist thus rewarded) Wordsworth finds that this Latin version has been made from a Greek text, but from a text which materially differs from the *Textus Receptus*. This he accounts for by the hypothesis that these Greek texts were themselves translations from a Hebrew or Aramaic original. This interesting hypothesis he endeavours to establish by showing that there are words in the Corbey MS. which can be best accounted for by the supposition of an Aramaic original. It must be confessed, however, that the intervening Greek version imparts a feeling of uncertainty to this line of evidence. More validity attaches to his other arguments, that Aramaic was the language which James would probably use, and that the Greek of the Epistle, as we have it, rather resembles the style of a professional interpreter than that of such a man as James.

Professor Sanday's laborious collation of the Corbey readings with those of the Vulgate and of other Old Latin texts is a feather in the cap of English scholarship, and must be a surprise to those who fancy that such work is accomplished only in Germany. The expenditure of knowledge and of toil is indeed so great that he who is not himself bitten with the specializing rage of the day may be tempted profanely to say that the game is not worth the candle. But even those who are not yet convinced that all labour is legitimate which can hope to ascertain so much as one letter of the defaced history of the past, must sympathize with the enthusiasm with which Professor Sanday anticipates a new era in Latin scholarship. Supposing that the variations of the Old Latin versions are due to differences in local usage, to the preference for certain words in certain localities, he apprehends the use to which this may be turned in the study of Latin. "If this is so, surely a dazzling prospect lies open to the theologian. [Is 'theologian' the right

word ?] Besides his own proper subject, the study of the versions as versions, it is for him more than for any one else to track out and delimitate these varieties of provincial speech. He possesses advantages which the classical philologist cannot hope for. He has at his command a number of MSS. dating back to very early times ; and, what is of especial importance, he has a large store of patristic quotations, by comparison with which he can assign, more or less satisfactorily, the texts before him to certain fixed localities."

The illustrious author of the *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches*, if he still takes an interest in sublunary controversies, may be supposed to look with a complacent smile on the fresh illustration brought to his great argument by the crop of *Symposia* which recent years have produced. And while no doubt amicable discussion may sometimes lead men to a mutual understanding and agreement, it may be feared that these modern *Symposia* do little more than confirm the insight of Milton in comparing Truth to the good Osiris, "her lovely form hewed into a thousand pieces and scattered to the four winds." But the only fault we find with the present *Symposium*¹ is that it does not hew truth into a sufficient number of pieces. The Churches are indeed well represented. Calvinist, Wesleyan, and Unitarian, Anglican and Romanist, Swedenborgian, Jewish and Conditionalist views are all fairly championed. But it would have been well had the Editor invited discussion from even a wider range of thought than that which is identified with one or other of our ecclesiastical creeds. For no account is here taken of the two most remarkable answers which in our day have been given to the question proposed to the Symposium, "What are the foundations of the belief in the immortality of man?" The Anthropologists, who have followed the lead of Mr. Spencer and who have traced the common belief in immortality to the dreams of savages, deserve consideration. Their views have, if not a growing, yet a pretty wide acceptance ; and it was well worth a Symposiast's trouble to show in what manner and degree our belief in immortality would be affected were these views proved to be true, and still more worth his trouble to show that they are not true. Another and very different answer has been given to the question by some of the foremost of our philosophical thinkers. Some of those who with more or less exactness may be classed as Hegelians, maintain in

¹ *Immortality. A Clerical Symposium on what are the Foundations of the Belief in the Immortality of Man.* (London: James Nisbet & Co., 1885.)

the strongest way that without personal immortality the world and its history are without purpose or adequate end. The clear exposition of this argument would have been a great gain to theology, and would materially have enhanced the value of this volume.

Dr. Vaughan's absorption in practical work has been a serious loss to expository literature. The little volume on the Epistle to the Philippians¹ which he now issues, welcome and satisfactory as it is, is a somewhat meagre fulfilment of the hopes which were many years ago excited by the purple pamphlet on the First Epistle to the Thessalonians. That gave promise of a series of expositions "for English readers" which should combine all the advantages of first-rate scholarship with simplicity. Dr. Vaughan does not encumber his page with references to grammatical and lexical authorities nor with citations from commentaries, but gives the nett result of his own study. This is a great saving of the reader's time; and it also allows him at once to apprehend the precise contribution to his knowledge which Dr. Vaughan makes. That contribution is considerable and consists largely in the accurate ascertainment of the meaning of words, and the light that is thrown upon them from their use in other parts of Scripture. Especially worthy of consideration is his interpretation of ἀπραγμός in ii. 6. Occasionally the English of the translation is hardly intelligible without the Greek, as in i. 17, "raise a vexation for my bonds." No notice is taken of the remarkable, and perhaps significant, bad grammar of ii. 1. "Charity" is rather too general a term to translate ἐπιεικής, iv. 5; and the rendering of ἰσόψυχον in ii. 20, is not satisfactory. The volume will be very helpful to many besides "English readers."

The *Cambridge Greek Testament* has achieved an excellence which puts it above criticism. But it is at any rate a pleasure to recognise that the high standard is maintained by the last issued volume.² Dr. Lumby has evidently spared no pains to make his work thorough and helpful. Many fresh illustrations from Jewish literature are given; and the Septuagint is never lost sight of as the grand aid towards the understanding of the language of the New Testament. In one or two instances (as in ii. 27 and 28) wo

¹ *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, with Translation, Paraphrase and Notes for English Readers.* By C. J. Vaughan, D.D. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1885.)

² *Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges. The Acts of the Apostles.* By J. Rawson Lumby, D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity. (Cambridge University Press, 1885.)

miss explanations of peculiar and probably Hebraizing syntax; and as the book is intended for schools it might have been rendered more attractive by illustrations from the classics and from English literature. The Introduction is also defective; but on the whole a more adequate and useful book could not be desired for use in schools and colleges.

It will be sufficient to chronicle the appearance of the following: (1) A very handy and pretty edition of the Text of Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament. This should find its way wherever Greek is read. (Macmillan.) (2) A second edition of Principal Edwards' *Commentary on First Corinthians*. That a second edition of so large and costly a volume should have been so speedily called for speaks for itself. (Hodder and Stoughton.) (3) A new volume of the *Pulpit Commentary* in which the exegesis of *Second Corinthians* is supplied by Archdeacon Farrar, while Prebendary Huxtable furnishes a copious exposition of the *Epistle to the Galatians*. The homiletics are by Dr. Thomas, Professor Croskery and others. The volume fully sustains the character which this too useful work has established for itself. (Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.)

MARCUS DODS.

BREVIA.

Hebraica.—A note supplementary to Dr. Curtiss' report of the progress of Hebrew studies in America (EXPOSITOR, 3rd series, vol. i. p. 312, etc.) may be welcome both to himself and to English readers. There is a quarterly periodical called *Hebraica*, which from modest beginnings has reached a high pitch of philological efficiency. It numbers among its contributors German and English as well as American writers, and is committed to progressively critical rather than antiquated Rabbinic methods. It needs about four hundred more subscribers to make it a success. The subscription for foreign countries is two dollars and a quarter annually. At the end of the October number is a list of the publications of the "Hebrew Publication Society," containing introductory works, which, if all of equal practical ability to Prof. Harper's *Elements of Hebrew* and *Introductory Hebrew Method and Manual* which lie before us, will be useful additions to our introductory literature. That they will supersede fuller and more distinctly scientific works (such as Wright's and Driver's) is not claimed

T. K. CHEYNE.

INDEX.

PAGE

Rev. Joseph Agar Beet.

Oltramare on Romans 156

Rev. T. K. Cheyne, D.D.

On Genesis xviii. xix. 203

Dr. M. M. Kalisch 390

On Genesis iii. 5 399

On Psalm xlix. 7 400

Hebraica 472

Rev. Professor W. P. Dickson, D.D.

Dr. Mommsen on the Neronian Reference of the Apoca-
lypse, and on the "Itala" 381

Rev. Marcus Dods, D.D.

The Lost Sheep and the Lost Piece of Money 16

Recent English Literature on the New Testament 148, 467

Rev. Professor S. R. Driver, D.D.

The Revised Version of the Old Testament.

I. The Book of Genesis 1

II. The Book of Exodus 81

III. The Books of Leviticus and Numbers 211

IV. The Books of Deuteronomy and Joshua 289

E.

Schrader's "Cuneiform Inscriptions" and the Old Testament 237

Rev. Professor J. M. Fuller, M.A.

The Book of Daniel in the Light of Recent Research and
Discovery.

III. Cyrus 437

	PAGE
Josiah Gilbert.	
Isaac Taylor	89
Rev. Professor F. Godet, D.D.	
The First Epistle to the Corinthians	70, 161
The Second Epistle to the Corinthians	370, 415
Professor A. Harnack, Ph.D.	
Bishop Lightfoot's "Ignatius and Polycarp"	401
Rev. A. C. Jennings, M.A. (and Rev. W. H. Lowe, M.A.)	
The Revised Version of the Old Testament:—	
A Critical Estimate	57, 119, 277, 346, 425
Rev. Professor A. F. Kirkpatrick, M.A.	
Recent Foreign Literature on the Old Testament	233
Rev. W. H. Lowe, M.A. (and Rev. A. C. Jennings, M.A.)	
The Revised Version of the Old Testament:—	
A Critical Estimate	57, 119, 277, 346, 425
Rev. Alexander Maclaren, D.D.	
The Epistle to the Colossians.	
VII. The Ultimate Purpose of Reconciliation and its Human Conditions	44
VIII. Joy in Suffering, and Triumph in the Manifested Mystery	106
IX. The Christian Ministry in its Theme, Methods, and Aims	187
X. Paul Striving for the Colossians	263
XI. Conciliatory and Hortatory Transition to Polemics	356
Professor John Massie, M.A.	
"I have received of the Lord"	206
Right Hon. Baron Moncreiff.	
Blaise Pascal	309, 327
Rev. H. C. G. Moule, M.A.	
A Study in the Connexion of Doctrines, Galatians ii. 20	447

	PAGE
Rev. Professor S. D. F. Salmond, D.D.	
Frédéric Godet	455
George Augustus Simcox, M.A.	
Dean Church	28
Professor Albrecht Socin.	
The Survey of Western Palestine. A Critical Estimate of the Work of the Palestine Restoration Fund . . .	241
Rev. Professor George T. Stokes, M.A.	
The Fayûm Gospel Fragment	132
Professor George J. Stokes, M.A.	
Dr. Martineau's Types of Ethical Theory	395
Professor H. L. Strack, D.D., Ph.D.	
The Work of Bible Revision in Germany :—	
I. Historic Part	178
Rev. Professor B. B. Warfield, D.D.	
Recent American Literature on the New Testament . . .	142
Messianic Psalms of the New Testament	301, 321
Rev. Alexander Whyte, D.D.	
Christ the Interpreter of Nature	224
Rev. J. E. Yonge, M.A.	
Heaping Coals of Fire on the Head	158
The Editor.	
Miss Rossetti's "Time Flies"	159
Dr. Marcus Dods on the Parables of our Lord	394

INDEX TO SCRIPTURES.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis iii. 5	399	Joshua	299
xv. 2	5	2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, 23	439
xvi. 13	6	Ezra i. 1-4	439
xviii., xix.	203	vi. 1	443
xxii. 14	7	Psalms xlix. 7	400
xlix. 5	9	Isaiah xlv. 28; xlv. 11; xli. 25	438
xlix. 10	10	Daniel x.	437
xlix. 24	15	Matthew vi. 24-34	224
Exodus iii. 14	81	xxvi. 30-34	132
iii. 15	82	Mark xiv. 26-30	132
xx. 6	84	Luke i. 42-45, 46-55, 68-79	301, 321
xxvii. 21	85	ii. 29-32	301, 321
xxxiii. 7-11	87	xv. 1-10	16
xxxiv. 13	88	Romans	150
Leviticus xvi. 8, 10, 26	214	xii. 20	158
xviii. 18	217	1 Corinthians	70, 161
xxiii. 2	219	xi. 29	206
xxvi. 30	220	2 Corinthians	370, 415
Numbers xxiv. 3.	223	Galatians ii. 20	447
Deuteronomy i. 1	289	Colossians i. 22, 23	44
vii. 2	290	i. 24-27	106
xviii. 15-18	295	i. 28-29	187
xxi. 4	294	ii. 1-3	263
xxxii. 17	295	ii. 4-7.	350
xxxiii. 2	296	Revelation	381
xxxiii. 6	297		